

SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN

VOL. I—THE VERB

BY

CHARLES E. BENNETT

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY



Boston

ALLYN AND BACON

LEIPSIC: THEODOR STAUFFER

1910

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
ERICA LIBRARIES

624557

Humanities
GREEK & LATIN

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY
CHARLES E. BENNETT

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

PREFACE.

IN venturing to prepare a work to replace the now antiquated Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*, I have endeavored to bear in mind the stricter standards of syntactical investigation imposed by the wider and exacter knowledge of to-day. Where adequate monographs existed, I have made use of them, but for most portions of the work I have been compelled to make independent collections.

“Early Latin” is necessarily a somewhat vague term. Holtze’s work ended with Terence. Bell, *De locativi in prisca Latinitate vi et usu*, Breslau, 1889, sets the later limit at 75 B.C. A definite date is really impossible, since archaic Latin does not terminate abruptly, but continues even down to imperial times. For practical purposes I have chosen 100 B.C. as the later limit of the archaic period, and have endeavored to consider all the remains of any syntactical significance from the earliest period down to this time. Had I extended the scope of the work for another quarter of a century, the additions would have been insignificant, — merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists and contemporary inscriptions.

References are to the following editions: Plautus, Lindsay; Terence, Dziatzko; Cato, *De Agricultura*, Keil; the fragments, Jordan; fragments of the dramatists, Ribbeck; other poetic fragments, Baehrens; fragments of the historians, Peter; fragments of the orators, Meyer-Dübner (Paris, 1837). Figures in parenthesis indicate the number of occurrences of the usage which they accompany. Examples without figures, unless accompanied by “e.g.,” are intended to represent the complete material belonging under the given topic. In many instances the citations may seem to some readers unnecessarily full, but I have so often been hampered in my own syntactical work by the

opposite defect that I have preferred to err by too copious, rather than too scanty, illustration. The fact is, it is impossible to foresee what particular information the student may seek in a syntactical manual; apparently gratuitous citations may therefore often prove of the greatest service.

In putting this volume through the press I have received most generous and valuable assistance from Professor Edwin W. Fay, Dr. Emory B. Lease, and my former pupil, Dr. Mary B. McElwain, to all of whom I here desire to express my sincere obligations.

The present volume will be followed at as early a date as practicable by the concluding portion of the work, on the cases, the adjectives, the pronouns, and the particles.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

ITHACA, November, 1910.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

AGREEMENT, VOICES, IMPERSONAL VERBS, OMISSION OF VERB.		PAGE
Agreement of Verb		1
Agreement in Number		1
Agreement in Person		3
The Voices		4
Peculiarities in the Use of the Active		4
Peculiarities in the Use of the Passive		6
Passive as Reflexive		6
Attraction of Active Verbs into the Passive		7
Impersonal Uses		7
Omission of the Verb		9

CHAPTER II.

TENSES OF THE INDICATIVE. (Especially in Principal Clauses.)		
Present Tense		10
Varieties of the Present Indicative		11
In General Truths, Statements of Customs, etc.		11
The Historical Present		11
The Present Indicative with <i>iam, iam dudum, quam dudum, iam pridem, iam diu, modo</i>		17
The Present used as Future		18
Positive Declarative Sentences		18
Negative Sentences		21
Questions		21
Present Indicative in Deliberative Questions		22
Present Indicative in Questions having the Force of the Imperative, Hortatory Subjunctive, etc.		24
The Imperfect Indicative		26
Denoting an Action as in Process, as going on, in Past Time		26
Denoting a Continuing State or Condition		29
Imperfect of Customary Action		30
Of Acts persisted in		31
The Aoristic Use of the Imperfect		32
Imperfects denoting a Future from a Past Standpoint		35

	PAGE
The 'Shifted' Imperfect	36
Further Peculiarities of Usage	36
Imperfect for Present	36
Imperfect with <i>iam dudum</i> , <i>iam pridem</i> , <i>iam diu</i>	37
The Inceptive and Conative Imperfects	37
The Future Indicative	38
Volitive Uses of the Future Indicative	38
Pure Future Uses	43
Optative Uses	43
The Achronistic Use of the Future Indicative	44
The 'Potential' Future	44
The Perfect Indicative	45
Present Perfect	45
Historical Perfect	46
The Pluperfect Indicative	47
Denoting an Action Prior to Another Past Act or to a Past Point of Time explicitly mentioned in the Immediate Context	48
Denoting an Act Prior to Another Past Act or Point of Time implied in the Context	49
Denoting a Past Act not conceived as Prior to Another Past Act	50
<i>Satius fuerat</i> , <i>aequius fuerat</i> , <i>par fuerat</i> , etc., in the Sense of 'would have been preferable,' 'would have been fairer,' etc.	52
Denoting the State resulting from a Completed Past Act	53
The Future Perfect Indicative	53
The Future Perfect with the Force of the Future	54
The Future Perfect with Future Perfect Force	58
In Principal Clauses unaccompanied by a Dependent Clause	58
In Principal Clauses accompanied by a Dependent Clause	58
The 'Shifted' Future Perfect	59
Future Perfect as Imperative	59

CHAPTER III.

THE INDICATIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

Conditional Sentences	60
Parataxis	60
Classification of Indicative Protases	60
Protasis in Present Indicative	60
Protasis in Present Indicative referring to Present Time or denoting a General Truth	60
Protases in Present Indicative referring to Future Time	65
Protasis in the Imperfect Indicative	67
Protasis in the Future Indicative	68
Protasis in the Perfect Indicative	70

Table of Contents.

vii

	PAGE
Protasis in the Pluperfect Indicative	73
Protasis in the Future Perfect Indicative	73
Protases exhibiting a Combination of Two Tenses in Coördination	76
Dependent Conditional Sentences	76
Substantive <i>si</i> -clauses	77
“Concessive” <i>si</i> -clauses	78
Temporal Clauses in the Indicative	79
<i>Quom</i> -clauses	79
<i>Quom</i> , ‘When’	79
The <i>quom</i> -clause is Descriptive	79
The <i>quom</i> -clause is Adverbial	79
<i>Quom extemplo</i>	83
<i>Quom primum</i>	83
<i>Quom puto, quom cogito</i> , etc., in Elliptical Expressions	83
<i>Quom inversum</i>	84
<i>Quom</i> Explicative	84
Substantive <i>quom</i> -clauses	85
<i>Quom</i> , ‘Since’ (‘seitdem’)	85
<i>Quom</i> , ‘While’	85
<i>Quom interea, quom interim</i>	85
<i>Quom magis</i> (<i>magis</i>)	86
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>ubi</i>	86
<i>Ubi primum</i>	90
<i>Extemplo ubi</i>	90
<i>Ubi</i> with Conditional Force	90
Substantive Clauses introduced by <i>ubi</i>	90
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>quando</i>	90
<i>Quandoque</i>	92
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>quoniam</i>	92
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>ut</i>	93
<i>Ut</i> , ‘When’	93
<i>Ut</i> , ‘Since’	94
<i>Ut</i> , ‘After’	94
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>dum</i>	94
<i>Dum</i> , ‘While’	94
<i>Dum</i> , ‘As long As’	97
<i>Dum</i> , ‘Until’	98
<i>Dum</i> Circumstantial	99
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>donec, donicum</i> , ‘Until’	100
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>postquam</i>	101
<i>Postquam</i> , ‘After’	101
<i>Postquam</i> , ‘Now That’	102
<i>Postquam</i> , ‘Since’	103
<i>Postquam</i> Causal	103
Temporal Clauses introduced by <i>prius quam</i> and <i>ante quam</i>	104
<i>Simul ac, simul, simul ut</i>	106

	PAGE
Clauses of Comparison in the Indicative	106
<i>Ut</i> -clauses	106
One Act or State in its Entirety is compared with Another	106
The <i>ut</i> -clause does not constitute a Formal Comparison, but merely serves as an Adverbial Modifier of the Main Clause	107
The <i>ut</i> -clause stands in Appositional Relation to the Contents of the Main Clause	109
<i>Ut; ita . . . ut</i> , equivalent to <i>qualis; talis . . . qualis</i>	110
<i>Ita . . . ut</i> in Asseverations	111
The <i>ut</i> -clause indicates Proportion	111
The <i>ut</i> -clause indicates the Standard or Norm according to which the Content of the Main Clause has Validity	111
<i>Ut = quanto</i>	113
<i>Utquomque</i>	113
<i>Sicut</i> -clauses	113
<i>Velut</i> -clauses	114
<i>Praeut</i>	115
<i>Quasi = sicut</i>	115
<i>Quam</i> -clauses	115
<i>Tam . . . quam</i>	115
<i>Ita . . . quam</i>	116
<i>Aequae . . . quam</i>	116
<i>Quam</i> alone without Correlative	116
After Comparatives	116
After Words implying a Comparative	118
With Superlatives	118
<i>Quam si, quasi</i>	118
<i>Tamquam = sicut</i>	119
Clauses introduced by <i>atque</i> , 'As,' 'Than'	119
<i>Proinde ac</i>	119
<i>Pariter ac</i>	119
<i>Talis ac</i>	119
<i>Aequae, adaeque ac</i>	119
<i>Similis atque</i>	119
Without Correlative	119
With Comparatives	119
With <i>alius, aliter</i> , etc.	119
<i>Atque uti</i>	119
Indicative in Indirect Questions	120
Pronominal Questions	120
Sentence Questions	122
Dependent Deliberative Questions	123
Causal Clauses in the Indicative	123
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quod</i>	123
Adverbial Clauses	123
Substantive <i>quod</i> -clauses	124

Table of Contents.

ix

	PAGE
Further Peculiarities in the Use of <i>quod</i>	125
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quia</i>	126
The Governing Verb is Expressed	126
The Governing Verb is not expressed, but is implied in a Question to which the <i>quia</i> -clause is the Answer	128
Substantive <i>quia</i> -clauses	130
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quoniam</i>	132
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quando</i>	132
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quom</i>	133
With Expressions of Rejoicing	134
With Expressions of Fear or Pain	134
With Expressions of Praising	134
With Expressions of Thanking	134
With Expressions of Congratulating	134
With Other Expressions	134
Substantive Clauses introduced by <i>quom</i> Causal	135
Causal Clauses introduced by <i>quatenus</i>	136
Causal Clauses of the Type : <i>Quid est quod</i> ? 'What is the Reason Why' ?	136
Type <i>quid est quod</i> ?	136
Type <i>quid hoc est quod</i> ?	136
Type <i>quid hoc negotist quod</i> ?	136
Type <i>hoc est quod</i>	137
Relative Causal Clauses	137
<i>Quippe qui</i>	138
Adversative Clauses in the Indicative	139
Adversative Clauses introduced by <i>etsi, tam etsi, etiam si, tamen si, tamen etsi</i>	139
Introduced by <i>etsi</i>	139
Introduced by <i>tam etsi (tametsi)</i>	139
Introduced by <i>etiam si</i>	139
Introduced by <i>tamen etsi</i>	140
Introduced by <i>tamen si</i>	140
Adversative Clauses introduced by <i>quamquam</i>	140
Without Correlative Particle in the Main Clause	140
With Correlative Particle (<i>tamen, verum tamen, at, tam</i>) in Main Clause	140
Corrective <i>quamquam</i>	141
Adversative Clauses introduced by <i>quom</i>	141
Without Correlative Particle in the Main Clause	141
With Correlative Particle (<i>tamen, tum, tam</i>) in the Main Clause	141
Indicative Adversative Clauses introduced by Relative Pronouns	142
Adversative Clauses introduced by <i>utut (ut ut)</i>	142
Indicative Clauses introduced by Local Particles	142
Clauses introduced by <i>ubi</i>	142

	PAGE
Clauses introduced by <i>qua</i>	143
Clauses introduced by <i>quo</i>	143
Clauses introduced by <i>unde</i>	143
Clauses introduced by <i>quotiens</i>	144
Clauses introduced by <i>quoad</i>	144

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

Original Force of the Latin Subjunctive	145
The Subjunctive	152
Optative	153
Volitive Uses	161
Subjunctive of Determined Resolution	161
The Jussive Subjunctive	162
Present Jussive	163
No Introductory Particle	163
Second Singular	163
Third Singular	163
Second Plural	164
Third Plural	164
Jussive with Introductory Particle	164
Perfect Jussive	166
The Hortatory Subjunctive	166
First Plural Hortatory	167
Affirmative	167
Negative	167
First Singular Hortatory	167
The Prohibitive Subjunctive	167
The Present Prohibitive	168
Second Singular with <i>ne</i>	168
Second Singular (Present Prohibitive) with <i>ni</i>	169
Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with <i>ne</i>	169
Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with <i>ni</i>	169
Second Plural Present Prohibitive	169
Third Plural Present Prohibitive	170
Present Prohibitive introduced by <i>numquam</i> , <i>nemo</i> , <i>nullus</i> , <i>non</i> , etc.	170
Present Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives (<i>neve</i> , <i>neu</i> , <i>nive</i> ; <i>neque</i> , <i>nec</i>)	170
The Perfect Prohibitive	171
With <i>ne</i>	171
Perfect Prohibitive introduced by <i>nullus</i> , <i>numquam</i> , <i>nil</i> , <i>nemo</i> , etc.	171
Perfect Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives, <i>neve</i> , <i>neu</i> , <i>neque</i> , <i>nec</i>	171

Table of Contents.

xi

	PAGE
On the Use of Negatives in the Prohibitive	172
On the Force of Tenses in the Prohibitive	173
Developments of the Jussive and Prohibitive	174
The Permissive Subjunctive	174
The Present Permissive	175
Affirmative	175
Negative	175
The Perfect Permissive	176
The Subjunctive of Compliance	176
Subjunctive of Unfulfilled Past Obligation	176
Affirmative	177
Negative	177
The Jussive as Protasis	178
The Prohibitive Subjunctive in Indirect Discourse	178
The Concessive Subjunctive	178
Deliberative Subjunctive	178
Subjunctive of Inquiry after a Command or Advice	179
Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness	179
Affirmative Questions of Duty or Fitness	181
Present Tense	181
Imperfect Tense	181
Perfect Tense	182
Negative Questions of Duty or Fitness	182
Present Tense	183
Imperfect Tense	183
True Deliberative Subjunctives	184
Subjunctive of Impossibility or Helplessness	185
Present Tense	185
Imperfect Tense	186
Perfect Tense	186
Subjunctive in Repudiating Questions and Exclamations	186
Affirmative Repudiating Questions and Exclamations	187
No Introductory Particle	187
Present Tense	187
Imperfect Tense	188
Perfect Tense	188
Introduced by <i>-ne</i>	188
Present Tense	188
Imperfect Tense	189
Perfect Tense	189
Introduced by <i>ut</i>	189
Present Tense	189
Imperfect Tense	189
Perfect Tense	189
Introduced by <i>-ne ut</i>	190

	PAGE
Present Tense	190
Imperfect Tense	190
Introduced by <i>utin</i>	190
Negative Repudiating Questions and Exclamations	191
Optative Uses	191
Present Optative	192
Affirmative	192
Without Particles	192
Present Optative with Reinforcing Particles	193
Asseverative Use of the Present Optative	194
Negative Present Optative	195
Perfect Optative	195
Affirmative	195
Without Particles	195
With Particles	196
Asseverative Use of the Perfect Optative	196
Negative Perfect Optative	196
Imperfect Optative	196
The Pluperfect Optative	197
Potential Uses	197
The 'Should'-'Would' Potential	197
Present Tense	197
<i>Velim, nolim, malim</i>	198
'Should'-'Would' Potential as Apodosis of Conditional Sentences	201
Perfect Tense	202
Imperfect Tense	203
Pluperfect Tense	205
'May' Potentials	205
'Can'-'Could' Potentials	206

CHAPTER V.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

Parataxis and Hypotaxis	208
Subjunctive Substantive Clauses	209
Substantive Clauses developed from the Volitive	210
Original Uses and Extensions	210
Classification of Substantive Clauses developed from the Volitive	212
Developed from the Jussive and Prohibitive	212
With Verbs of Ordering and Commanding	212
With <i>volo</i> and <i>nolo</i> in the Senses, 'I want you To,' 'I want you not To'	215
The Type <i>nolo ames</i>	216

Table of Contents.

xiii

	PAGE
With Verbs of Begging, Requesting, etc., including, as Extensions, Verbs of succeeding in one's Request	217
With <i>impetro, exoro</i>	219
With Verbs of Advising, Warning, Exhorting, Reminding, Admonishing, etc., including, as Extensions, Verbs of Inducing, and, as Extensions of Verbs of Inducing, Verbs of Compelling	220
With Verbs of Inducing, Persuading, etc.	222
With Verbs of Forcing	223
With <i>fac, facito</i> , and Other Forms of <i>facio</i>	224
With <i>efficio, perficio</i> , and Similar Verbs	228
With <i>curo</i> and Expressions of Striving	229
With <i>vide, videto</i> , 'See to It,' etc.	230
With <i>cave, caveto</i> , etc.	232
With Verbs of Permitting, Granting, Allowing	234
With Verbs of Deciding, Resolving, etc.	236
With <i>potin</i> , etc.	237
With <i>optimum est, æquum est, oportet, tempus est</i> , etc.	238
With <i>opus est, usus est, necesse est</i>	239
With Verbs of Hindering, Preventing, etc.	239
With Verbs of Deserving	240
With <i>quid est quod; nihil est quod</i> , etc.	241
Miscellaneous Expressions	242
Perfect Subjunctive used with Force of Future in Substantive Clauses developed from the Jussive and Prohibitive	242
Connecting Negatives in Substantive Clauses developed from the Jussive and Prohibitive	243
Absence of Introductory Particles in Subordinate Clauses	244
Substantive Clauses developed from the Deliberative	246
With <i>quin</i>	246
With <i>cur (quor)</i>	248
With <i>quam ob rem</i>	248
With <i>qua causa</i>	249
With <i>quapropter</i>	249
Substantive Clauses developed from the Optative	249
With Verbs of Wishing, Desiring, Preferring, etc.	249
With Verbs of Fearing	252
Subjunctive of Purpose	255
Classification of Purpose Clauses	256
Purpose Clauses introduced by <i>ut</i>	256
Purpose Clauses introduced by <i>ne</i>	257
Purpose Clauses introduced by <i>ut ne</i>	258
Relative Clauses of Purpose	258
Relative Purpose Clauses with <i>dignus, indignus, idoneus</i> , etc.	260
Purpose Clauses introduced by <i>quo = ut</i>	261

	PAGE
Purpose Clauses introduced by <i>qui = ut</i>	261
Substantive Clauses of Purpose	262
Connecting Negatives in Purpose Clauses	263
The Stipulative Subjunctive	263
Stipulative Clauses with the Force of 'On the Understanding that, that Not'; 'Under the Agreement that, that Not'	264
Stipulative Clauses with the Force of 'On Pain Of,' 'Under Penalty Of'	265
Stipulative Clauses with the Force of 'On Condition That'	265
Stipulative Clauses with the Force of 'By' with a Verbal Noun	266
Negative Stipulative Clauses with the Force of 'Without' with a Verbal Noun	266
Substantive Stipulative Clauses	267
Clauses of Proviso	268
With <i>dum</i>	268
With <i>dum ne, dum ni</i>	269
With <i>dum modo</i>	269
With <i>modo</i>	269
With <i>ut modo, modo ut</i>	269
<i>Dum</i> -clauses denoting a Wish	270
Subjunctive with <i>quamvis, quantumvis, ut</i>, 'Although'	270
The Subjunctive in Conditional Sentences	271
Classification of Subjunctive Protases	273
Protasis in the Present Subjunctive	273
Protasis in the Perfect Subjunctive	277
Protasis in the Imperfect Subjunctive	278
Protasis in the Pluperfect Subjunctive	280
Conditional Sentences in which the Protasis has Adversative ('Concessive') Force	282
Subjunctive Protasis with Indicative Apodosis	283
Dependent Conditional Sentences	284
Clauses of Conditional Comparison	285
With <i>quasi</i>	285
With <i>quam si</i>	287
With <i>ut si</i>	287
With <i>tamquam</i>	287
With <i>tamquam si</i>	287
With <i>ac si</i>	287
With <i>ut quasi si</i>	287
Descriptive Clauses	288
Classification of Subjunctive Descriptive Clauses	288
Potential Descriptive Clauses	288
Descriptive Clauses of Fact	289
Jussive Descriptive Clauses	294

Table of Contents.

XV

	PAGE
Deliberative Descriptive Clauses	295
Other Relative Clauses	295
Restrictive Clauses	295
Subjunctive in Result Clauses	296
Result Clauses introduced by <i>ut</i>	297
Relative Clauses of Result	298
Substantive Clauses of Result	299
Adverbial <i>quin</i>-clauses	300
Subjunctive with <i>quom</i>	302
<i>Quom</i> Temporal	302
<i>Quom</i> Causal	302
<i>Quom</i> Adversative	303
<i>Quom</i> = <i>si</i> Adversative	303
Subjunctive with <i>dum</i> Temporal, <i>donec</i>, <i>donecum</i>	304
<i>Dum</i>	304
With <i>donec</i> , <i>donecum</i>	305
Subjunctive by Attraction (Assimilation)	305
Subjunctive assimilated or attracted to Another Subjunctive	305
Classification of Subjunctives attracted or assimilated to Another Subjunctive	307
Subjunctive by Attraction in Clauses dependent on an Infinitive	312
Subjunctive in <i>Oratio obliqua</i>	315
Implied Indirect Discourse	318
Subjunctive in Principal Clauses in <i>oratio obliqua</i>	318
Subjunctive Clauses introduced by <i>quod</i>, <i>quia</i>, <i>quo</i>, etc.	318
With <i>quod</i>	318
With <i>quia</i>	319
With <i>non quo</i> , <i>quam quo</i> , <i>non quod</i> , <i>non quia</i> , <i>quin</i>	319
Subjunctive of Indefinite Second Singular in Subordinate Clauses	319
Subjunctive Clauses with <i>quam</i>, including <i>ante quam</i>, <i>potius quam</i>, <i>prius quam</i>	322
<i>quam</i>	322
<i>Quam</i> , <i>potius quam</i>	322
With <i>ante quam</i> , <i>prius quam</i>	324
Subjunctive in Indirect Questions	326
Classification of Indirect Questions	327
Word (or Pronominal) Questions	328
Sentence Questions	331
Single Questions	332
Double Questions	332
Other Logical Types of Indirect Questions	334
Future Time in Indirect Questions	334
Prolepsis in Indirect Questions	335
Words followed by Subjunctive of Indirect Question	335

	PAGE
Subjunctive with <i>quod</i> , 'Although'	338
Iterative Subjunctive	338
Sequence of Tenses in the Subjunctive	338
After the Indicative	338
After Principal Tenses	338
After Historical Tenses	340
After the Subjunctive	342
After the Imperative	344
After the Infinitive	345

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMPERATIVE.

Affirmative Uses of the Imperative	348
Present	348
Form	348
Function	350
Present for Future	350
Logical Force of the Present Imperative	351
Future	354
Form	354
Function	358
Future Referring to Present	358
Logical Force of Future Imperative	359
Negative Uses of the Imperative	362
Present Tense	362
<i>Noli, nolite</i> with the Infinitive	363
Future Tense	363
Connecting Negatives with the Imperative	364
<i>Nolito</i> with the Infinitive	365

CHAPTER VII.

THE INFINITIVE.

The Infinitive with Subject Accusative	367
As Object	367
Verba Declarandi	367
Verba Sentiendi	372
Verba Affectuum	377
Verba Voluntatis	379
Dependent on the Context	383
Infinitive as Object, with Subject Accusative Understood	383
<i>Aequom censeo</i> Type	388
Passive Construction of Verbs taking the Infinitive with Subject Accusative as Object	388

Table of Contents.

xvii

	PAGE
As Subject	389
Infinitive as Subject with Subject Accusative Understood	396
Infinitive with Subject Accusative, used as an Appositive	397
Infinitive with Subject Accusative, used as Predicate	399
Infinitive without Subject Accusative	399
As Object	399
Denoting Another Action of the Same Subject	399
<i>Aequom censeo</i> Type	406
As Subject	406
Infinitive without Subject Accusative used as Appositive	412
Infinitive without Subject Accusative, as Predicate	413
Use of the Impersonal Infinitive	413
As Object	414
As Subject	415
As Appositive	416
Infinitive to be supplied from the Context	416
Infinitive dependent on Nouns	417
The Infinitive with Adjectives	418
Infinitive of Purpose	418
Historical Infinitive	419
Examples	421
Infinitive in Exclamations	423
Infinitives of Exclamation without <i>-ne</i>	424
Infinitives of Exclamation with <i>-ne</i>	424
Infinitives in Titles	425
Tenses of the Infinitive	426
Present Infinitive	426
Present for Future	426
With <i>memini</i>	427
Perfect Infinitive	427
Perfect Infinitive with Force of Present	427

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTICIPLES, GERUND, AND SUPINE, ETC.

Participles	429
The Present Active Participle	429
Attributive Uses of the Present Participle	430
Appositive Uses of the Present Participle	430
Predicate Uses of the Present Participle	433
Adjective Uses of the Present Participle	434
Substantive Uses of the Present Participle	434
Time of the Present Participle	435

	PAGE
The Future Active Participle	435
The Perfect Passive Participle	435
Some Peculiarities in Tense and Voice Function	435
Attributive Uses of the Perfect Participle	436
Appositive Uses of the Perfect Participle	436
Predicate Uses of the Perfect Participle	437
Adjective Uses of the Perfect Participle	440
Substantive Uses of the Perfect Participle	440
Special Idiomatic Uses of the Participle	441
The Gerundive	441
The Gerundive as Adjective	442
The Gerundive as Participle in the Nominative	442
The Genitive of the Gerundive	442
The Dative of the Gerundive	443
The Accusative of the Gerundive	443
The Ablative of the Gerundive	445
The Gerund	446
Genitive of the Gerund	446
Dative of the Gerund	449
Accusative of the Gerund	449
Ablative of the Gerund	450
Ablative without Prepositions	450
The Gerund has a Direct Object	450
The Gerund is used alone without Object or Modifier	450
The Gerund has an Adverbial Modifier	452
Ablative dependent on Prepositions	452
The Supine	453
The Supine in <i>-um</i>	453
The Supine in <i>-u</i>	456
Used as Ablative of Specification	457
With <i>opus est</i>	457
As Ablative of Separation	457
The Periphrastic Conjugations	457
The Periphrastic Conjugation formed by combining the Future Active Participle with the Verb <i>sum</i>	457
The Periphrastic Conjugation formed by combining the Gerundive with the Verb <i>sum</i>	458
The Present Participle combined with the Verb <i>sum</i>	458

CHAPTER IX.

THE SENTENCE-QUESTION.

Questions introduced by <i>-ne</i>	460
<i>-ne</i> appended to the Verb	460
<i>-ne</i> appended to Pronouns	466

Table of Contents.

xix

	PAGE
- <i>ne</i> appended to Nouns	468
- <i>ne</i> appended to Adjectives and Participles	469
- <i>ne</i> appended to Adverbs	469
<i>Potin</i>	471
<i>Nonne</i>	472
- <i>ne</i> appended to Relatives	472
- <i>ne</i> appended to Conjunctions	473
- <i>ne</i> appended to Interrogatives	473
Questions introduced by <i>num</i> , <i>numnam</i> , <i>numne</i> , <i>numquis</i>	473
<i>Num</i>	473
<i>Numnam</i> , <i>numne</i>	474
<i>Numquis</i> , <i>numquid</i>	475
Questions introduced by <i>ecquis</i> , <i>ecquid</i> , <i>enumquam</i>	475
Questions without Interrogative Particle	476
Questions whose Interrogative Force is Slight or Questionable	476
Repetitions	477
<i>Rogas</i> , <i>negas</i> , <i>rogitas</i> , etc.	478
Questions with <i>non</i> and Other Negative Words	478
Questions with <i>iam</i> and <i>etiam</i>	480
Continued and Supplementary Questions	481
Questions in the Infinitive	484
<i>An</i> and Disjunctive Questions	484
Complete Disjunctive Questions	486
<i>Ne</i> <i>an</i>	486
<i>Ne</i> <i>an non</i>	486
— <i>an</i>	487
— <i>an non</i>	487
<i>An</i> <i>an</i>	487
<i>Utrum</i> - <i>ne</i> <i>an</i>	487
<i>Utrum</i> <i>an</i>	487
<i>Utrum</i> - <i>ne</i> - <i>ne</i>	487
— - <i>ne</i>	487

SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN.

PART I.

THE VERB.

CHAPTER I.

AGREEMENT, VOICES, IMPERSONAL VERBS, OMISSION OF VERB.

AGREEMENT OF THE VERB.

AGREEMENT IN NUMBER.

1. **With compound subject.** Examples of a combination of singular subjects are not specially numerous. The plural verb is found: Bacch. 886, *et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio*; Poen. 576, *egrediuntur Milphio una et vilicus*; Pseud. 233, *iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi volumus*; And. 54, *dum aetas metus magister prohibebant*; Ad. 213, *ego vapulando, ille verberando usque ambo defessi sumus*. The singular: Amph. 249, *namque ego fui illi et meus pater*; Aul. 217, *quoniam tu me et ego te qualis sis scio*; 276, *probrum atque partitudo prope adest*; 580, *tu, aula, multos inimicos habes atque istuc aurum*; 584, *novisti me et ego te*; 732, *cui tanta mala maestitudoque optigit*; Cas. 314, *si tu nolis filiusque tuos*; M. G. 224, *qua cibatus commeatusque ad te possit pervenire*; Most. 322, *visne ego te ac tu me amplectare*; Poen. 203, *sed Adelphasium exit atque Anterastilis*; Pseud. 906, *me et Calidorum servatum volunt esse*; 1097, *epistula atque imago me certum facit*; Rud. 1411, *tu vidulum et ego gnatam inveni*; Hec. 2, *intervenit vitium et calamitas*; Eun. 541, *locus tempus constitutumst*; Ad. 340, *tua fama et gnatae vita in dubium veniet*; 470, *persuasit nox amor vinum adulescentia*; 835, *ne tuae nos rationes et tuos animus aequos subvortat*; Acc. 349, *persuasit maeror anxietudo error dolor*; Afran. 140, *res*

tempus locus simul otium hortabatur. In these the singular is obviously due either to the tendency to make the verb agree with the nearer subject, or to the fact that the different elements of the compound subject are felt as constituting a whole. The following example is different: Ad. 76, hoc pater ac dominus interest, where the subject is only formally compound. Logically, *pater* alone is the subject ('a father differs from a master').

2. Singular subjects connected by disjunctive particles. Here we find sometimes the singular, sometimes the plural. Singular: Bacch. 79, quid si apud te eveniat prandium aut potatio? Merc. 186, tam certe quam ego te aut tu me vides; 653, quae patria aut domus tibi stabilis esse poterit? And. 463, utinam aut hic surdus aut haec muta facta sit. Plural: Ad. 103, haec si neque ego neque tu fecimus; Naev. Trag. 37, egone an ille iniurie facimus?

3. Where the subject and predicate are of different numbers.

a) The verb agrees with its subject: And. 950, dos, Pamphile, est decem talenta; Amph. 97, haec urbs est Thebae.

b) The verb is attracted to the number of the predicate: Asin. 155, quae dieis aurum atque argentum est; Enn. Epicharm. 507, Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi; And. 555, amantium irae amoris integratior; Ad. 6, Synapthnescontes Diphili comoediast.

4. Construction according to sense. As a result of the meaning, we find a plural verb with a singular subject in the following instances:

a) With *uterque*: Cure. 187, uterque insaniunt; Eun. 840, apud Antiphonem uterque, mater et pater, domi erant (attraction to the appositive); Cato, Agr. 70, facito ut uterque sublimiter stent. In the following passages, often cited as illustrations of a plural verb with *uterque*, the *uterque* is probably rather in distributive apposition with the subject: Bacch. 754, facite, cum amica sua uterque, adcubitum eat; Epid. 719, quam hodie per urbem uterque sumus defessi quaerere; Trin. 623, celeri gradu eunt uterque; Ad. 130, curemus aequam uterque partem.

b) With *uter*, *neuter*: Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam; 1119, uter eratis, tun an ille, maior? 784, quotiens edixi tibi ut caveres neuter ad me iretis!

c) With *si quis*: Cato, fr. 23, 14, si quis advorsus rem suam quid fieri arbitrantur; 62, 3, si quis alter ab altero peterent.

d) With *quisque*: Capt. 500, ubi quisque vident, eunt obviam; Epid. 212, filios suos quisque visunt; Most. 103, sibi quisque inde exemplum expetunt. In many examples cited in illustration of this use *quisque* is probably to be taken as in partitive apposition, e.g. Poen. 107, omnis meretrices, ubi quisque habitant, invenit.

e) With *quisquam*: Amph. 1071, neque nostrum quisquam sensit; 1099, neque nostrum quisquam audivimus.

f) With *pars, partim*: Most. 114, sed magna pars morem hunc induxerunt; Capt. 232, fere maxuma pars morem hunc homines habent; Trin. 34, hic pluris pauciorum gratiam faciunt pars hominum; Truc. 105; fr. 29, maior pars populi reptant fame; Cato, fr. 23, 7, haut scio an partim eorum fuerint; 52, 12, sunt partim, qui petunt (the sing. 64, 8, quom partim illorum ad eundem modum erat); Enn. Ann. 44, pars saxa iactant, inter se licitantur.

g) With *aliquis*: Epid. 399, exite huc aliquis; Merc. 131, aperite aliquis; Acc. 425, Oeneum aliquis cette in conspectum. For further examples, see below under the imperative.

h) With *tantum hominum*, etc.: Poen. 619, quid huc tantum hominum incedunt? And. 745, quid illi hominum litigant!

i) With other expressions: Epid. 213, tum meretricum numerus tantus obviam ornatae occurrebant; Cato, fr. 19, 16, omnis Graecia gloriam decoravere monumentis; CIL, i, 196, 20, neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous tribus arfuisse velent; Trin. 425, tarpeitae mille drachumarum, quas de ratione dehibuisti, redditae; And. 625, hocine credibile, tanta vecordia quoiquam ut siet, ut malis gaudeant alterius; Cato, fr. 62, 6, si sponsionem fecissent Gellius cum Turio; H. T. 473, Syrus cum illo vostro consusurrant.

In expressions like Stich. 370, alius alium percontamur, I take *alius* as in partitive apposition with the subject; so also Cure. 378; Pseud. 1260, altera alterum inter seprehendunt.

AGREEMENT IN PERSON.

1. Where we have **subjects of different persons**, we find in Early Latin conformity with the usual practice of the later period, e.g. Bacch. 886, et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio; Pseud. 233, iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi volumus; Ad. 213, ego vapulando, ille verberando usque ambo defessi sumus; 103, haec si neque ego neque

tu fecimus. Yet often the verb is singular and agrees with the nearer subject, as Merc. 186, tam certe quam ego te aut tu me vides; Aul. 217, quoniam tu me et ego te qualis sis scio; 584; Most. 322; Rud. 1411, quem propter tu vidulum et ego gnatam inveni.

2. Attraction of person. A subject in the 3d singular is often attracted to the person (and number) of a genitive of the whole (*nostrum, vostrum*) expressed or understood:

a) 1st person: Amph. 1071, neque nostrum quisquam sensinus (for *quisquam sensit*); 1099, neque nostrum quisquam audivimus.

b) 2d person: Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam (for *uter meruit*); 1119, uter eratis, tun an ille, maior? 785, neuter ad me iretis; especially with the imperative in expressions like Epid. 399, exite huc aliquis; Merc. 131, aperite aliquis. The lack of a 3d person present imperative naturally leads to the use of the plural here, though the logical subject is singular (*aliquis vostrum*).

THE VOICES.

PECULIARITIES IN THE USE OF THE ACTIVE.

1. Absolute use: Amph. 352, tutatust domi; Eun. 780, solus Sannio servat domi; Cist. 104, ut hanc sinas hic servare apud me; Amph. 423, argumentis vicit; And. 185, meum gnatum rumor est amare; 191; Ad. 118; Amph. 243, equites iubet dextera inducere.

2. Many verbs regularly used as transitive occur at times in an intransitive use:

a) Verbs used as equivalent to reflexives:

ago: Bacch. 1106, unde agis? Pers. 216, quo agis? Poen. 333; but *quo te agis* occurs Trin. 1078.

aperio: Pers. 300, foris aperit.

aplico: Enn. Trag. 77, quo applicem?

avorto: M. G. 203, ecce avortit; cf. Titin. 93, quo te avortisti?

capesso: Rud. 178, ad saxum quo capessit; cf. 172, horsum se capessit.

convorto: Stich. 414, in amicitiam convortimus; cf. Rud. 999, in vidulum te convortes.

habeo: Most. 709, quam habeat male; Phor. 429, bene habent principia.

insinuo: Cist. 92, in amicitiam insinuavit cum matre; cf. 89, insinuavit se.

lavo (-are): regularly used in reflexive sense in Early Latin: Amph. 802, lavisti, lavi; M. G. 251, dormit, ornatur, lavat; Stich. 568, ibo lautum; 569, lavelo; Truc. 322; 323; And. 483, fac ista ut lavet; Eun. 592, accersitur lavatum; iit, lavit; 595; 596; Cato, Agr. 156, 3, lavet calida.

praebeo: Phor. 476, Phormio strenuom hominem praebuit.

recipio: Pers. 51, recipe quam primum potes; Bacch. 294, rursum in portum recipimus; Merc. 498; Rud. 880; but Merc. 881, recipiam me; Pers. 46, recipe te.

sisto: Cure. 287, nec quisquam quin capite sistat; M. G. 850.

suffulcio: Epid. 83, nisi suffulcis firmiter.

vorto: Amph. 251, vortentibus Telobois; Merc. 433, quo vortisti?

b) In the following the reflexive equivalence is not present:

aequipero: Pacuv. 407, aequirerent Iovi.

augeo: Cato, fr. 8, 6, eo res eorum auxit.

colo: Poen. 13, exerce vocem quam per vivisque et colis; Pseud. 202 a.

demuto: M. G. 1130, numquid demutare videtur?

expedio: Amph. 521, nequiter expeditit prima parasitatio.

grandire: Cato, Agr. 141, 2, vineta grandire siris!

habeo: Trin. 193, ubi nunc adulescens habet; 390.

incendo: Enn. Trag. 291, civitatem video Argivom incendere.

lenio: M. G. 583, dum haec irae leniunt.

quasso: Asin. 403, quassanti capite incedit; Bacch. 305; M. G. 851; 856.

suppedito: Eun. 1076, ut tuo amori suppeditare possint; Asin. 423; Trin. 1119.

vorto: Cure. 729, quae res bene vortat mi; Pers. 453; *et pass.*

3. Some verbs ordinarily intransitive are occasionally used transitively, e.g.: Eun. 550, erumpere gaudium; Cato, Agr. 157, 3; Men. 400, intra portam penetravi pedem; Trin. 837, ruere antemnas; Ad. 319. Reflexive uses: And. 562, ex illis sese emersurum malis; Amph. 250, perduelles penetrant se in fugam; Trin. 276, 291, me penetravi; 314; Truc. 44; Eun. 599, foras omnes proruont se.

PECULIARITIES IN THE USE OF THE PASSIVE.

Passive as Reflexive.¹

Examples:

accingor: Phor. 318, accingere!

adsimulor: M. G. 152, alia esse adsimulabitur.

amicior: Pers. 307, amicibor gloriose; Cas. 723.

aperior: Cas. 434, audio aperiri fores; 779; M. G. 527; 985; 1198; Trin. 400.

avortor: Amph. 927, ab impudicis dictis avorti volo.

cingor: Amph. 308, cingitur; certe expedit se.

comprimor: Most. 203, vix comprimor.

conicior: Poen. 69, conicitur ipse in morbum ex aegritudine.

convortor: Stich. 402, salvos convortor domum.

curor: Poen. 693, hospitium ubi curer mollius.

declinor: Hec. 200, neque declinatam ab aliarum ingenio ullam reperias.

dirumpor: Cas. 809, dirumpi cantando hymenaeum licet; 810.

dispertior: Cure. 189, etiam dispertimini?

figor; fricor: see under *lavor*.

exunguor: Truc. 312, exunguimini.

inmutor: Phor. 206, non possum inmutarier.

lavor: Poen. 219, numquam concessamus lavari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari, poliri, expoliri, pingi, fingi; 228.

moveor: Asin. 788, illam moveri gestio.

obsaturor: H. T. 869, istius obsaturabere.

ornor: H. T. 288, quae ornantur sibi; Poen. 123, ibo; ornabor; see also under *lavor*.

pingor: see under *lavor*.

polior: see under *lavor*.

reprimor: M. G. 1368, vix reprimor.

retineor: Trin. 641, nam retineri nequeo quin dicam.

ringor: Phor. 341, ille ringitur.

rumpor: Afran. 127, risu rumpier.

¹ Nölting, Ueber das lateinische Deponens, 1859; Nauester, Beiträge zur Lehre vom Deponens und Passiv d. Lateinischen, 1907; Ernout, Recherches sur l'emploi du passif Latin, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xv, p. 322 ff.

simulor: Eun. 606, tum is essem, qui simulabar.

teneor: Cas. 239, vix teneor quin dicam.

tergeor: see under *lavor*.

unguor: Cas. 226, unguor.

vocor: Capt. 38, ille vocatur Philocrates, hic Tyndarus.

vortor: Most. 218, in anginam me velim vorti.

Different from the foregoing, in which the force is reflexive, are the following, which are indirect middles: Aul. 116, dexterās copulantur; Epid. 223, quid erat induta; 225, utin impluvium induta fuerit; Men. 190; 514; Rud. 207; Eun. 708, eamst indutus; 1016.

Attraction of Active Verbs into the Passive.

Several verbs governing the infinitive are attracted into the passive when the infinitive is passive or deponent:

coeptus sum: Men. 718, iure coepta appellarist Canes.

desitus sum: Most. 958, desitum est potarier.

intermissus est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum bibi.

nequitur, nequitum est: Rud. 1064, ut nequitur comprimi; Plaut. fr. 109, retrahi nequitur; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi; Cato, fr. 8, 17, id nequitum exaugurari.

occeptus sum: Eun. 22, occeptast agi.

osus sum: Amph. 900, osa sum optuerier.

potestur: Enn. fr. 574, retrahi potestur; Pacuv. 100, potestur investigari; Cato, Agr. 154, uti transferri possitur; CIL, i, 198, 66, ubi de plano legi possitur; Caelius (Peter), 100, 7, sine periculo bellum geri poteratur.

quitur, quitus sum: Stat. 279, non sarciri quitur; Acc. Baehr. 18, unde omnia perdisci ac percipi queuntur; Acc. Trag. 661, impelli quitus sum; Hec. 572, nosci non quitast.

IMPERSONAL USES.¹

The verb is used impersonally with great freedom in Early Latin. In addition to the common *licet*, *oportet*, *decet*, *paenitet*, *piget*, *pudet*, and *est* with adjectives, we find very numerous instances of the impersonal use of the passive, of which the following illustrations are representative:

¹ Ernout, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xv, p. 290 ff.

1. In the uncompound tenses of the indicative and subjunctive.

a) Present indicative: Pseud. 273, *amatur atque egetur*; Poen. 835, *bibitur, estur*; Capt. 80, *caletur*; always in this form in the impersonal use (*calet* is personal); so also Truc. 65; Poen. 890, *creditur*; Trin. 479, *cernitur*; H. T. 44, *curritur*; Bacch. 447, *itur*; so also Aul. 527; Pseud. 453; And. 480, *fit*; Pers. 386, *nubitur*; Pseud. 516, *praedicitur*; Rud. 1018, *reditur*; Phor. 778, *siletur*; Eun. 271, *statur*; so also Pseud. 457; Pers. 309, *ut valetur*? H. T. 154, *vivitur*; so also Trin. 65; Cato, Agr. 14, 1, *iussitur*. Deponent: Pacuv. 182, *cuius a te veretur maxime*; Atta, 7, *nilne te populi veretur*?

b) Future indicative (less frequent): Stich. 509, *credetur*; Cas. 131, *curabitur*; so also And. 403; 980, *despondebitur*; Poen. 734, *dicetur*; so H. T. 88; Cas. 758, *ibitur*; so Trin. 578; Cato, Agr. 88, 2, *nubilabitur*; 144, 1, *debebitur*; 145, 1, *deducetur*; 3, 6, *ducetur*; 1, 4, *emetur*; 4, *peccabitur*; CIL, i, 198, 24, *petetur*; so 26; 86; i, 200, 33, *ambigetur*; 69, *comperietur*.

c) Subjunctive (infrequent): Poen. 533, *curratur*; M. G. 946, *ne quid titubetur*; Cato, Agr. 39, 2, *ne cessetur*; 5, 7, *substernatur*; 66, 1, *introeatur*; CIL, i, 198, 49, 70, *iudicetur*; so also 197, 10.

2. Compound tenses of the indicative.

a) Perfect: Pseud. 85, *actum est*; so also 1221; Stich. 751; Trin. 308; 595; 608; Amph. 219, *exitum est*; Poen. 909, *paratum est*; Men. 964, *proventum est*; Amph. 249, *pugnatum est*; Aul. 604, *renuntiatum est*; Merc. 511, *solitum est*; Stich. 467, *sustentatum est*; 586; Truc. 9, *ventumst*.

b) Future perfect: Bacch. 757, *ubi erit accubitum*; CIL, i, 198, 24, *unde petitum erit*; so 27.

3. The infinitive. For this very frequent impersonal use, see under the Infinitive (p. 413 f.).

4. The impersonal use of the second periphrastic conjugation. This occurs with great frequency, especially in the present indicative and the infinitive:

Examples: M. G. 35, *adsentandum est*; Poen. 567, *agendum est*; so 1243; Rud. 719; H. T. 321, *audiundumst*; 400, *carendum erat*; so M. G. 1210; Most. 1069, *captandumst*; so Acc. 541; Most. 701, *cenandum et cubandumst*; Pseud. 331, *currendumst*; Acc. 541, *est eundum*; Cas. 409, *patiundumst*; M. G. 180, *pereundum est*. Rarely in the

subjunctive: M. G. 170, optandum foret. Infinitive: Capt. 767, redauspicandum esse; M. G. 359, esse pereundum; Cas. 411, tibi cavendum censeo.

5. Verbs ordinarily impersonal used in Early Latin as personal. The following exemplify this usage: Aul. 491, quo lubeant nubant; Trin. 211, quod lubeant (lubeat P) sciant; And. 481, quae adsolent quaeque oportent; Stich. 51, me haec condicio non paenitet; Pacuv. 31, proloqui non (prologo nunc, codd) paenitebunt; Cas. 877, ita nunc pudeo; Ad. 754, non te haec pudet? Besides this we have, as later, the use of neuter singular pronouns with these impersonals, *e.g.* Epid. 107, idne te pudet? Ad. 84, quem neque pudet quicquam.

OMISSION OF THE VERB.¹

The verb is frequently omitted in Early Latin, particularly forms of *sum*, especially in the function of auxiliary:

1st person sing.: Men. 614, ne ego ecastor mulier misera; M. G. 370, ego stulta quae cum hoc fabuler; 443; Rud. 520, quis vivit me miserior? : ego multo miserior quam tu; Eun. 1062, quor ego in te conspicio regionibus? : vobis fretus.

2d person sing.: Pers. 484, *iam liberta auctus* is now usually written *auctu's*; so other passages containing periphrastic forms or predicate adjectives in *-us*.

3d person sing.: M. G. 1041, hau mirum si te habes carum; Ad. 678, quid nobis cum illis? Eun. 511; Phor. 440, si quid opus fuerit, heus domo me (sc. arcesso); And. 300, verbum unum cave de nuptiis (sc. dicas), ne ad morbum hoc etiam (sc. accedat).

1st person plu.: Rud. 369, nos ventis iactatae perpetuam noctem; 690; Cure. 354, postquam cenati, talos poscit; And. 285, accessi, vos semotae, nos soli.

2d person plu.: Asin. 134, mare haud est mare: vos mare acerrium; And. 285, accessi: vos semotae.

3d person plu.: Amph. 1133, quae futura et quae facta eloquar; 1061, ubi parturit, deos invocat, strepitus, crepitus, tonitrus; Stich. 212, quot cenae mortuae! Eun. 780, ubi alii?

¹ Olsen, *Quaestionum Plantinarum de verbo substantivo specimen*, 1884; Meillet, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, xiv, p. 1 ff.

CHAPTER II.

TENSES OF THE INDICATIVE.¹

(ESPECIALLY IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.)

PRESENT TENSE.

In connection with the tenses of the indicative two important factors enter into consideration, viz.: the *kind of action* ("Aktionsart") and the *time-sphere* ("Zeitstufe") of the action or state. The present formations of Indo-European were not narrowly limited in either of these two respects. As regards the *kind of action*, they might designate the following varieties:

- 1) Momentary ("punktuell");
- 2) Progressive ("cursiv," "durativ");
- 3) Iterative, indicating the successive repetition of the same act;
- 4) Completed;
- 5) Terminative, in which an act in process at the same time suggests a definite terminus; see Delbrück, op. cit. ii, p. 14 ff.

Originally these different "Aktionsarten" seem to have been associated to a certain extent with specific types of present formation; *ibid.* p. 16 ff., but of this there is slight trace, if any, in Latin.

As regards *time-sphere*, the present indicative in Indo-European indicated, in the main, acts belonging to the speaker's present. An exception is found in the case of those present formations denoting momentary actions ("punktuelle Aktionsarten"). The time-sphere of these in Indo-European was the future; Delbrück, op. cit. p. 309. The Indo-European seems to have possessed also the timeless ("achronistic") use of the present indicative, i.e. its use in the statement of general truths, customs, etc. Delbrück, op. cit. p. 261, derives this use from that referring to the present, suggesting that, where adverbs meaning "always" were combined with the present,

¹ Herbig, *Aktionsart und Zeitstufe*, *Indog. Forsch.* vi, pp. 167 ff.; Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 102 ff.; Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* ii, p. 1 ff.; Brugmann, *Kurze Vgl. Gramm.* p. 491 ff.; 559 ff.

the timeless use might most naturally arise. But it seems more natural to regard the achronistic use as original.¹

In Latin some scholars recognize only progressive action as expressed by the present indicative. But I agree with those who hold that the present expresses also momentary (aoristic) acts as well. The latter usage, in fact, is of great frequency. Thus in *Most.* 949, *puere, nemo hic habitat*, and in 950, *non hic Philolaches habitat?* there seems no rational ground for recognizing progressive action. *Habito*, to be sure, is a verb of durative meaning; but the obvious sense is: 'lives,' not 'is living.' So in hundreds of instances in which the present is used, e.g. *M. G.* 5, *hanc machaeram consolari volo*; 31, *nolo istaec nunc*; 36, *scio quid vis dicere*; 49, *offae monent*; 72, *videtur tempus esse ut eamus*.

The time-sphere in Latin is ordinarily the speaker's present, but the achronistic use is also not infrequent. Whether the historical present and the present referring to the future come from the former usage or the latter, is uncertain; see below.

VARIETIES OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE.²

1. In general truths, statements of customs, etc. This use is common and presents no peculiarities worth notice. Examples are: *Capt.* 232, *morem hunc homines habent: quod sibi volunt, dum impetrant, boni sunt*; *ubi iam penes sese habent, ex bonis pessumi fiunt*; *And.* 309, *facile omnes, quom valemus, recta consilia aegrotis damus*. This usage is to be referred to the achronistic use of the present indicative (see above, p. 10), i.e. the fact stated is represented as true not only for the speaker's present, but also as something that has been true in the past, and will be true in time to come; cf. *Herbig*, *op. cit.* p. 159; 183.

2. The historical present.³ This usage was Indo-European. Its origin is variously explained. Some scholars regard it as resulting

¹ So *Blase*, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 102.

² See, in general, *Blase*, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 102 ff.; *Methner*, *Tempus- und Moduslehre*, p. 110 ff.; *Joseph Schneider*, *De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, 1888, p. 4 ff.

³ *Emery*, *Annie C.*, *The Historical Present in Early Latin*, 1897; *Blase*, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 103 ff.; *Brugmann*, *Berichte der königlichen sächs. Gesell. der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl. xxxv, p. 169.

from the dramatic picturing of past events as now occurring and as passing in imagination before the mind of the speaker or writer at the present time. Others regard it as a development of the achronistic use of the present. This view is supported by Hoffmann, *Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum im Latein*, p. 14; also by Brugmann, *loc. cit.* Both of these scholars regard the reference to the past in the historical present as due to the context, the tense in this usage having originally been *per se* entirely timeless. This attitude leads Brugmann to declare that, instead of recalling the past to the present in imagination, the writer or speaker rather puts himself back in the past. Which of these two explanations of the origin of the usage is correct, cannot be determined. Either is possible. At all events, in the historical present the speaker views the occurrences "as if they were going on before his eyes in the sphere of his own present, whether he does this by bringing the events out of the past into his actual present, or by putting himself back into their past. In either case he makes the present of the events his present."¹

Emery (*op. cit.*, p. 9 ff.) gives a complete list of all the verbs in Early Latin in which the historical present is found. "An examination of the collection," she continues, "shows that it is chiefly verbs of incomplete and continued action, as opposed to verbs of momentary action, which tend toward the historical present. These verbs of incomplete and continued action are verbs that imply vision on the part of the speaker. They indicate that he is reviewing the events denoted by them and considering them in their process of completion instead of simply recognizing the fact that they once took place in the past" (p. 22).

Neither the premises nor the conclusions of the paragraph just quoted seem to me to be valid. I cannot admit that an examination of the verbs in the list reveals any such predominance of verbs of durative character. The list contains some two hundred and eighty different verbs, and it is obviously impossible to examine them here in detail. I will only observe that some eighty-two verbs in the list are admitted by the author to be either primarily verbs of momentary action, or verbs denoting both momentary and progressive action. That the others, as a class, are far from denoting progressive action, will, I believe,

¹ Emery, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

be clear to those who examine the entire list in detail. That this is true, may perhaps be indicated by taking at random a number of successive verbs held to belong in the main to the progressive class. Thus, p. 10, we have: respondeo, nomino, clamo, inclamo, conclamo, exclamo, clamito, boo, voco, invoco, provoco, revoco, invito, arcesso, offirmo, posco, postulo, oro, exoro, obsecro, precor, impero, iubeo; p. 19, do, reddo, dedo, devoveo, commendo, accipio, recipio, ostendo, placeo, lubet, decet, pareo, sequor, consequor, adnuo, abdo, consono, tinnio, cano, contonat, tumultuor, perstrepo, interpello, saluto, gratulor, plaudo, desero, relinquo, desino. Some of these, without question, primarily denote progressive action, but the majority seem to me clearly to denote acts that primarily are not progressive; and the same is true of the entire list of two hundred and eighty verbs, taken as a whole. Moreover, many of these verbs occur in passages in which the perfect alternates with the historical present in the same passage. In fact, the disparity between the number of perfects and historical presents of the same verb is not great. I open again, at random, as before, and take a number of successive verbs. The first numeral shows the number of historical presents, the second the number of perfects, of each verb occurring in Early Latin: dico, 18, 11; interrogo, 3, 1; respondeo, 3, 4; exclamo, 7, 1; voco, 4, 2; iubeo, 7, 6; increpo, 1, 1; taceo, 1, 1; video, 12, 4; videor, 2, 7; aspicio, 4, 2. (62, 40.) In the main the balance is not so very far from even. A total of seventy-eight verbs used in both tenses shows 239:204. Either, then, the author's inference for the present must hold for the perfect, too, or is of no significance for the present.

It is beyond question, I believe, that the use of the historical present in Early Latin has no connection with progressive verbs, — no more than the historical perfect. Further, I do not believe that any verb used in the historical present in Early Latin ordinarily denotes progressive action, whether the verb itself designates an act that is progressive or one that is momentary. To my mind, Rodemeyer, *Das Präsens Historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides*, is correct when he maintains that the historical present narrates the bare fact of an action which took place in a sphere of time determined as past by the context. In other words, the historical present is aoristic in action. When it is urged that this is inconsistent with the vivid

picturesqueness of the historical present in actual use, I would observe that this is only apparently so. Each individual historical present in a series may perfectly well be aoristic, while the series itself gives us the effect of a moving whole. In other words, the progression lies in the succession of aoristic acts, not in the acts individually. An examination of the material gathered in Emery's dissertation will, I am confident, show that it is unnatural to take the presents as anything but momentary, and that it is this very momentariness which is the chief factor in the artistic effect produced by the use of the historical present. The speaker does *not* dwell upon the acts as in process, but touches lightly upon each *en passant*, thus avoiding the tedium and drag on the attention which would naturally follow the suggestion of a series of acts each represented as progressive. I have said that the momentariness of the action was the chief factor in the artistic effect produced by the historical present. This, of course, is supplemented by the simultaneous conception that the acts occur in the speaker's present. I should, therefore, define the historical present as a tense used of a series of momentary acts belonging to the past, into which the speaker projects himself. This definition will demand modification only so far as other tenses occur in combination with the historical present. As a matter of fact the historical present seldom or never occurs alone, but only in connection with the imperfect, perfect, historical infinitive, or pluperfect, as will be shown in detail in the material which follows.

a) The historical present varied with the historical perfect.¹

In combinations of this kind the perfect is often used to introduce the narration and to close it, the presents being placed between. Examples: True. 645 ff.

Rus mane dudum hinc ire me iussit pater
 Ut bubus glandem prandio depromerem.
 Post illoc quam veni, advenit, si dis placet,
 Ad villam argentum meo qui debebat patri,
 Qui ovis Tarentinas erat mercatus de patre.
 Quaerit patrem. Dico esse in urbe. Interrogo
 Quid eum velit * * * * *

¹ I follow the classification of material presented in Emery's dissertation.

Homo cruminam sibi de collo detrahit,
 Minas viginti mi dat. Accipio lubens,
 Condo in cruminam. Ille abiit. Ego * * minas
 Ovis in crumina hac in urbem detuli.

In the following, Capt. 478 ff., we have an introductory perfect, followed by presents, but without concluding perfect:

Nam uti dudum hinc abii, accessi ad adulescentes in foro.
 'Salvete,' inquam. 'Quo inus una?' inquam: atque illi tacent.
 'Quis ait "hoc" aut quis profitetur?' inquam. Quasi muti silent,
 Neque me rident. 'Ubi cenamus?' inquam. Atque illi abnuunt.
 Dico unum ridiculum dictum de dictis melioribus,
 Quibus solebam menstrualis epulas ante adipiscier:
 Nemo ridet; scivi extemplo rem de conpecto geri.
 Ne canem quidem irritatam voluit quisquam imitari,
 Saltem, si non adriderent, dentes ut restringerent.
 Abeo ab illis, postquam video me sic ludificari;
 Pergo ad alios, venio ad alios, deinde ad alios: una res!

In Phormio, 862 ff. we have a succession of presents with a perfect at the close:

Ubi in gynaeceum ire occipio, puer ad me adcurrit Mida,
 Pone prendit pallio, resupinat: respicio, rogo
 Quam ob rem retineat me: ait esse vetitum intro ad eram accedere.
 'Sophrona modo fratrem huc' inquit 'senis introduxit Chremem.'
 Eumque nunc esse intus cum illis. Hoc ubi ego audivi, ad fores
 Suspenso gradu placide ire perrexī.

Other characteristic examples of presents varying in one way or another with perfects are: Aul. 371 ff.; Curc. 329 ff.; Ad. 617 ff.; And. 353 ff.; Hec. 38 ff.

b) The historical present varied with the imperfect.

This combination is of rare occurrence. The only examples cited by Emery are Afran. 140, proficiscor: res tempus locus, simul otium hortabatur; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3; Enn. Ann. 140; 288; Lucil. 296, 5.

c) The historical present varied with the historical perfect and imperfect. A characteristic illustration is Capt. 498:

Quid est suavius quam bene rem gerere
 Bono publico, sicut ego feci heri, quom
 Emi hosce homines: ubi quisque vident,
 Eunt obviam gratulanturque eam rem.
 Ita me miserum restitendo retinendo lassum reddiderunt:
 Vix ex gratulando miser iam eminebam.
 Tandem abii ad praetorem; ibi vix requievi:
 Rogo syngraphum: datur mi ilico: dedi Tyndaro: ille abiit domum.
 Inde ilico praevertor domum, postquam id actum est;
 Ego protinus ad fratrem inde abii, mei ubi sunt alii captivi.
 Rogo Philocratem ex Alide equis omnium norit:
 Tandem hic exclamat eum sibi esse sodalem;
 Dico eum esse apud me; hic extemplo orat opsecratque eum sibi
 ut liceat videre:
 Iussi ilico hunc exsolvi.

Other examples are Amph. 1061 ff.; Epid. 209 ff.; H. T. 121 ff.; Eun. 575 ff.; Trag. Incert. 5 ff.; Enn. Ann. 28 ff.; 55 ff.

d) The historical present is varied with the pluperfect. Only Cure. 644 ff.:

Ea me spectatum tulerat per Dionysia.
 Postquam illo ventumst, iam ut me collocaverat,
 Exoritur ventus turbo: spectacula ibi ruont:
 Ego pertimesco: ibi me nescioquis arripit
 Timidam atque pavidam.

e) Historical present varied with the historical perfect and pluperfect. This is likewise rare. Most. 486 ff.:

Abimus omnes cubitum, condormivimus.
 Lucernam forte oblitus fueram extinguere:
 Atque ille exclamat derepente maxumum.

* * * * *

Cf. Eun. 629 ff.

f) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the imperfect, and the pluperfect. Examples: Rud. 37 ff.; Phor. 592 ff. This combination is infrequent.

g) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the imperfect, and the historical infinitive, e.g. Amph. 1107 ff.:

postquam in cunas conditust,
 Devolant angues iubati deorsum inpluvium duo
 Maximi: continuo extollunt ambo capita
 . . . sed angues oculis omnis circumvisere.
 Postquam pueros conspicati, pergunt ad cunas citi:
 Ego cunas recessim rursum vorsum trahere et ducere,
 Metuens pueris, mihi formidans, tantoque angues acrius
 Persequi. Postquam conspexit angues ille alter puer,
 Citus e cunis exilit, facit recta in anguis impetum:

Alterum alteraprehendit eos manu perniciter.

Cf. also Amph. 203 ff.; Merc. 42 ff.; Eun. 397 ff.; And. 51 ff.

h) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the imperfect, the pluperfect, and the historical infinitive, e.g. Phor. 71 ff.; Hec. 114 ff.

An examination of the foregoing material along with the other citations in Emery reveals to me no essential difference between the use of the historical present and the historical perfect, except that in the main the present seems to give the effect of greater vividness. In general, I assent to the verdict of Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, p. 103, who says that the historical present alternates arbitrarily with the perfect. This alternation was doubtless practiced for the sake of giving variety to long descriptive or narrative passages. But I doubt whether, if in a given instance, the presents were changed to perfects and the perfects to presents, any canon of usage would be violated, or whether any difference of force (barring the greater vividness of the present) would be recognizable.

Brugmann (Kurze Vergl. Gramm., p. 572) recognizes also a Praesens Tabulare, e.g. CIL, i, 30, Scipio Cisauna Samnio cepit, subigit omne Loucanam opsidisque abducit. This usage originated in inscriptional records, and is obviously related to the historical present.

3. The present indicative with *iam*, *iam dudum*, *quam dudum*, *iam pridem*, *iam diu*, *modo*.¹ Here the present is equivalent to the present perfect.

a) With *iam dudum*: As. 741, *iam dudum est intus*; Bacch. 109, *iam dudum tacitus te sequor*; 890, *iam dudum hercle equidem sen-*

¹ See Langen, Beiträge zum Plautus, 1881, p. 41 f.

tio; Cas. 368, iam dudum hercle fabulor; 414; 540; 803; Cist. 508, scis iam dudum omnem meam sententiam; Merc. 138, iam dudum sputo sanguinem; 556; 617; M. G. 580, iam dudum scio; 1301; 1398; Rud. 1030, *ecquid condicionis audes ferre?* : : iam dudum fero; Poen. 12, iam dudum exspecto; 1161; Pseud. 1215, mihi iam dudum ille Surus cor perfrigefacit; Stich. 344, iam dudum ego istum patior dicere iniuste mihi; Trin. 812; 1000; H. T. 409, iam dudum exspectat; 882, quid illic iam dudum cessat? Eun. 448, iam dudum te amat; iam dudum facile fit quod doleat; 743; 816; 917; Phor. 289, iam dudum audio; 471, nos iam dudum accusamus; Hec. 336, iam dudum audio hic tumultuari; Ad. 720, te iam dudum quaero; Enn. Trag. 34, iam dudum animus atque aures avent; Afran. 197, studeo iam dudum; Acc. 682, iam dudum exsulo; Stat. 13, iam dudum depopulat macellum; Turp. 24, iam dudum audio. *Dudum* alone, M. G. 406, dudum edepol planumst id quidem.

b) With *quam dudum*, Stich. 528, quam dudum in portum venis? 310.

c) With *iam diu*, Pseud. 233, iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi volumus; 261, iam diu scio qui fuit; Ad. 931, iam diu non potest.

d) With *modo*, Hec. 458, advenis modo.

e) With *iam*, Most. 79, triennium iam hinc abest; 589, multos me iam dies frustramini; 954, sex menses iam hic nemo habitat.

f) With *iam pridem*: Pseud. 466, iam pridem tu me spernis; Rud. 963, novi iam pridem.

4. The present used as future¹ (apart from the use in deliberative questions, for which see below, p. 22). Instances of this usage are frequent in Early Latin. Its origin is usually referred to the achronistic use of the present indicative; see p. 10. Following Sjögren, I group the material according to A. Positive declarative sentences; B. Negative declarative sentences; C. Questions.

A. Positive Declarative Sentences.

a) In expressions of the type: 'I'll be back immediately.'

1) Regularly in the verb *redire*, e.g. M. G. 1020, iam ad te redeo; so Merc. 963; Pseud. 1157; Stich. 523; Ad. 757, post huc redeo.

¹ See especially Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, 1906, p. 6 ff. This supersedes all previous discussions of the subject. But see also Blase,

These are in dialogue. In soliloquy we find Cist. 704, *redeo intro*; M. G. 592, *redeo in senatum rusum*; Rud. 904. The future of *redire* is found only Amph. 530 (a soothing assurance) and Capt. 497.

2) *Reverti*, on the other hand, occurs only in the future, e.g. Pseud. 1159; And. 485 (E, Don, *revortor*); Sjögren, p. 7 f.

3) *Revenire* occurs only in the future perfect (with future force; see below under the Future Perfect), Bacch. 1066; M. G. 863. So Truc. 547, *mox huc venero*.

4) The future is regular with *esse*, *adesse* (Sjögren, p. 9). *Continuo hic adero*, H. T. 502, is the Mss. reading, but was changed to *adsum* by Bentley, who is followed by modern editors.

5) In other expressions of this type. The present is found As. 379, *iam ego recurro huc*; Bacch. 794, 1052, *iam exeo ad te*; Eun. 493, *post huc continuo exeo*; Stich. 623, *poste ad te continuo transeo*; 535; Cas. 145. But the future is used of an act to be consummated less immediately, e.g. Stich. 614, *non metuo*; *per hortum transibo*; so Capt. 457.

b) *Abire*. The present of this occurs with future force some 40 times in dialogue, e.g. Bacch. 902, *abeo ad forum igitur*. Once in soliloquy, Epid. 665, *abeo intro*. The future: Cas. 962, *quasi non audiam abibo*.

c) Expressions with the force: 'I'll approach,' 'I'll accost.' Bacch. 980, *quid quod te misi? ecquid egisti?::rogas? congregere!::gradior*. But when a speaker merely expresses a resolve to accost another, the future is regular, e.g. Rud. 309, *sed quos perconter video; adibo*.

d) The simple *ire*.

1) The present of this referring to the immediate future is common in dialogue, e.g. Poen. 190, *ego in aedem Veneris eo*; so Asin. 108; Cas. 715; Merc. 385; Rud. 403; Eun. 580; Hec. 273; and frequently elsewhere.

2) The future also is frequent in the same sense of the immediate future, e.g. Bacch. 1060, *ego ad forum autem hinc ibo*; Cas. 526; Eun. 921; H. T. 173; Ad. 632; and frequently.

3) The future is naturally used of acts to take place in the less

immediate future, e.g. Most. 1131, *quin venis? :: promitte, ego ibo pro te*; Merc. 222; and elsewhere.

e) Other verbs of motion.

1) *Sequi*. Following a command or exhortation, *sequor* occurs some thirty times, e.g. Poen. 502, *sequere hac! :: sequor*.

2) But the future is used to indicate that one will follow soon, e.g. Men. 431, *eamus intro. :: iam sequar te*; Amph. 544; so Cist. 773; and probably regularly in such context.

3) Other verbs: H. T. 1000, *quid hoc autem? senex exit foras: ego fugio*; Hec. 513, *porto hoc iurgium ad uxorem . . . atque evomam*; Amph. 1143, *ego in caelum migro*.

4) In And. 957, *proviso quid agat Pamphilus. atque eccum*, we probably have a genuine present, 'I am on my way to see.' Expressions of this sort occur frequently where the purpose of the dramatist is to acquaint the audience through one of the performers with the dramatic situation. Other examples of the same kind are: Eun. 1005; H. T. 1046; Most. 880; Poen. 847; Merc. 804; And. 414; Eun. 923; Ad. 549.

f) In so-called rhetorical presents and equivalent perfects.

1) In expressions of the type *perii, actum est*. These are usually accompanied by a protasis. Examples: Asin. 287, *perii, nisi Libanum invenio iam*; Capt. 749, *peristis, nisi iam hunc abducitis*; so Asin. 243; Cist. 671; M. G. 828; Asin. 918, *nam ni impetro, regem perdi*; Rud. 683, *nisi quid re praesidi apparas, acta haec res est*; and frequently.

2) Presents: e.g. Phor. 179, *nullus es, nisi iam aliquod tibi consilium celere reperis*; Most. 539, *manifesta res est, nisi quid occurro prius*; H. T. 672, *triumpho, si licet me latere tecto abscedere*; Poen. 671, *rex sum, si ego illum hodie ad me adlexero*; Trin. 561, *nam qui vivamus nil est, si illum amiserit*; Rud. 168, *salvae sunt, si illos fluctus devitaverint*; Asin. 244; Capt. 539; Epid. 82; Stat. 46.

g) In some miscellaneous expressions: Bacch. 886, *et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio*; Stich. 453, *ego hunc lacero diem*; 612, *ibisne ad cenam foras? :: apud fratrem ceno*; 415; Most. 827, *satis boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice*; Pseud. 60, *proxima Dionysia. :: cras ea quidem sunt*; Eun. 338, '*scin quid ego te volebam?*' "dic." '*cras est mihi iudicium.*' Atta, 9, *cras est communis dies*; Cas. 447, pro-

tollo mortem mihi; And. 594, domum ibo atque huc renuntio; 732, sponsae pater intervenit; repudio consilium; Aul. 400; Trin. 815; H. T. 804; 1002; Bacch. 364; Asin. 114.

B. Negative Sentences.

There is noticeable a distinct tendency in Early Latin to use the present in negative expressions, where the corresponding affirmative expression takes the future, especially in expressions indicating an unwillingness to comply with some suggestion or request ('resistance to pressure'). Thus, corresponding to the affirmative futures, *audiam, dabo, dicam, faciam, pergam*, etc., we find the present in Phor. 486, *audi, obseero. :: non audio*; Rud. 946; Phor. 388, (*dic nomen. ::*) *non dico*; 669, *nil do*; Most. 261, *tum tu igitur cedo purpurisum. :: non do*; Cas. 231, *mane! :: non maneo*; 373, *gratiam facias! :: neque facio nec censeo*; Men. 150, *perge! :: non pergo hercle*; Amph. 449, *non illi obtempero*; As. 480, *in ius te voco. :: non eo*; Cas. 149; Rud. 1371; Trin. 1059; and in the 3d person, Bacch. 592, *non it; negat se ituram*; Stich. 608; And. 371. But where the will of the speaker sinks into the background, the future is employed, e.g. Most. 1070, *non ego illi extemplo hamum ostendam*; cf. And. 396; Rud. 959. *Posse*, also, referring to the future, when accompanied by a negative, has a fondness for the present, e.g. Ep. 84, *nisi suffulcis firmiter, non potes subsistere*; H. T. 679, *nulla mihi res posthac potest iam intervenire*; Gracchus (Meyer, p. 230), *si repudiarit, non potest quin*.

C. Questions.

Questions referring to the future occasionally take the present indicative.

a) With *quam mox* the present is regularly employed, e.g. Truc. 207, *quam mox te huc recipis? :: iam hic ero*; Asin. 449, *quam mox mi operam das?* Cas. 742, *quam mox recreas me?* Pseud. 1166; Rud. 1227, *quam mox licet te compellare?* 1412, *quam mox mi argentum redditur?* Stich. 533, *quam mox coctast cena?* Rud. 342. The future is never found with *quam mox* in Early Latin.

b) In double questions, Aul. 660, *abin annon?* Capt. 846, *iuben annon iubes astitui aulas?* Cure. 566, *reddin annon virginem?* M. G. 449, *mittis me annon mittis?* Pers. 533, *tacen annon taces?* Pseud.

1246, pedes, statis annon? Rud. 1399, tacen annon? Truc. 755, redin annon redis? 825, dicin annon? And. 186, hocine agis annon? Rodenbusch, op. cit. p. 41, states that in double questions referring to the future the present alone is used.

c) Other expressions: Aul. 289, quouis ducit filiam? 255, quid nunc? etiam mihi despondes filiam? Asin. 480, non eo.: non is? 712, datisme argentum? Bacch. 911, satin est, si plura ex me audiet? Pseud. 874, quanti istuc unum me coquinare perdoces? 1139, ecquis hoc aperit? Truc. 255, ecquis intus exit? 359, hicine hodie cenas? And. 301, daturne illa Pamphilo hodie nuptum? 321, hodie uxorem ducis? H. T. 611, quid agis?

Except in questions, it will be noted that the use of the present as a future is limited almost exclusively to the first person singular. This is entirely natural, as the speaker is perfectly well aware of his own volition, but is not competent to assert the volition of a second or third person. In questions, for the same reasons, the second person is the rule, since these inquire after the volition of the person addressed. In other words it is the volitional element apparently which develops secondarily the future force.

5. Present indicative in deliberative questions.¹ In this discussion of the indicative in deliberative questions I use the term 'deliberative' not in the exact sense, but as conveying an inquiry after a command, or, perhaps more accurately, an inquiry after advice; cf. under the deliberative subjunctive, p. 178. Sjögren, p. 81 ff., uses the term "konsultative Fragen." Sjögren's exhaustive discussion of these questions establishes conclusively that they are questions asking for advice, and that they never (or very rarely) cover any of the other varieties of the numerous subjunctive uses ordinarily grouped under the name "deliberative," such as questions expressing despair, true deliberatives, subjunctives of duty or fitness, repudiating questions. In this he differs from Deane, who (Proceedings Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxi, p. xxxiii ff.) expresses the opinion that there is no difference between

¹ Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, p. 81 ff.; Madvig, *Opuscula Academica*, ii, p. 40 ff.; Deane, *Deliberative Questions in Terence*, *Proceedings Amer. Phil. Assoc.* xxi, p. xxxiii ff.; Neumann, *De futuri usu*, 1888, 16 ff.; Morris, *Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence*, *Am. Jour. Phil.* x, p. 397 ff.; xi, p. 16 ff.; *Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus*, *Am. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 133 ff.

the indicative and subjunctive in these questions. But as Sjögren demonstrates, *quid agam* is used only in soliloquy in true deliberatives, or else in dialogue in questions of helplessness or despair, whereas *quid ago* (barring Phor. 736) is not used in soliloquy at all, and in dialogue is confined to questions asking for advice. Examples:

a) Questions with *iamne* or *iam*: Men. 176, *iam fores ferio?* :: *feri*; *vel mane etiam*; M. G. 1400, *iamne in hominem involo?* :: *inmo etiam prius verberetur*; Cas. 503; Cure. 132; Eun. 814; Stat. 35. Plural: Eun. 492, *iamne imus?*

b) After *quam mox*: M. G. 1406, *quam mox seco?* Bacch. 775; 880; Men. 153. Plural: Eun. 788, *quam mox irruimus?*

c) Questions introduced by particles (usually *-ne*) or pronouns: Bacch. 1196, *quid ago?* So Epid. 693; Pers. 666; Phor. 447; H. T. 343; Trin. 1062. Plural: M. G. 250, *quid agimus?* So Men. 844; Pseud. 1160; Eun. 1081; 1088; Phor. 1007; Ad. 538; in the form *quid nunc agimus*, Pseud. 722; Epid. 157; Eun. 811; Asin. 755, *addone?* :: *adde*; Bacch. 1168, *etiam redditis?* an *ego experior tecum vim maiorem?* Capt. 479 ff., *quo imus ad prandium?* *ubi cenamus?* Cas. 405, *compressan palma an porrecta ferio?* 977; Epid. 143, *quo a tarpezita peto?* Men. 231, *an quasi mare omnis circumimus insulas?* 320, *satin obsonatumst, an obsono amplius?* M. G. 1036, *vocon ergo hanc quae te quaerit?* 1424, *verberon etiam an mittis?* Most. 774, *eon?* *voco huc hominem?* Stich. 531, *hodiene exoneramus navem?* 750, *utrubi accumbo?* And. 315, *adeon ad eum?* Eun. 434, *purgon ego me?*

d) Without introductory pronoun or particle, Poen. 1224, *pergo* (*perge*, *codd*) *etiam temptare?* Plural: M. G. 613, *gerimus rem?* Phor. 812, *hanc igitur mittimus?*

e) All of the foregoing examples are in the 1st person. One or two instances of the 3d person also occur: Cist. 768, *quid fit?* So Pseud. 1159; Rud. 687, *unde iste animus mi invenitur?*

The foregoing material, which is fairly complete for Early Latin, shows clearly that the present indicative in "deliberative" questions is confined to dialogue. The only exception is Phor. 736, *quid ago?* *adeo, maneo?* which occurs in soliloquy.

As already stated, the usage is almost exclusively restricted to questions asking for advice. The only exceptions I have noted are:

Amph. 391, die, non nocebo. : : tuae fide credo! So Cas. 1007; And. 497, credon tibi hoc nunc, peperisse hanc e Pamphilo! All of these seem to have repudiating force (see p. 186).

A difference of opinion exists in regard to the interpretation of passages like the following: Merc. 130, at etiam asto? at etiam cesso foribus facere hisce assulas? Rud. 677, cesso ego illas consolari? Capt. 827; Cas. 237; 723; Epid. 342; M. G. 896; Pers. 197; Truc. 630. All of these contain *cesso* with a following infinitive and occur in soliloquy. Most editors take these expressions as interrogative. By this interpretation they are true deliberatives, thus forming an exception to Sjögren's principle that the present indicative is not employed in true deliberative questions. Others regard the expressions with *cesso* just cited as declarative, not interrogative. This is Lindsay's view.

6. Present indicative in questions having the force of the imperative, hortatory subjunctive, etc.¹ These questions are introduced by *quin*, *etiam*, *non*, *-ne*.

a) Imperative questions introduced by *quin*: Amph. 775, quin tu istanc iubes circumferri; 918, quin huc adducis? Asin. 30, quin tu ergo rogas? 325; 380; 597; 659; 661; 850; 868; Bacch. 245, quin tu reddis? 861; Capt. 592, quin fugis? 636; Cas. 599, quin tu suspendis te? 100; 903; Cure. 84, quin tu taces? The same phrase also Men. 561; 1114; Merc. 494; Cure. 94, quin das saviu? 183; 611, quin tu is in malam crucem? The same phrase also Men. 915; Rud. 518; Epid. 303, quin tu is intro? 479; 615; 685; Men. 382, quin, amabo, is intro? 639, quin dicis? The same phrase also Merc. 724; M. G. 1183; Pers. 144; Men. 660, quin refers pallam domum? 747, quin respicis? 912, quin tu te suspendis? Merc. 174, quin tu expedis? 778, quin abis? The same phrase also M. G. 1085, 1087; Poen. 608; Merc. 915, quin intro ducis me? 929; 942; 951; M. G. 446, quin retines altrinsecus? 751, quin tu istanc orationem amoves? 1067; 1387; Most. 343, quin, amabo, accubas? 572; 1131; Pers. 397, quin tu me ducis? 424; 437; 625; Poen. 373, quin adire sinis? 972; P'seud. 40, quin legis? 241, quin revocas? 350; 638; 713; 880; 891; 1147; Rud. 122, quin tu in paludem is? Stich. 479, quin tu promit-

¹ Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativs bei Plautus, 1871, p. 23 f.; Stahl, De natura atque usu imperativi apud Terentium, 1886, p. 35 f.

tis? 716, quin bibis? Trin. 502, quin fabulare? 802; 1026; And. 399, quin taces? H. T. 832, quin accipis? Ph. 429, quin quod est ferundum fers? Examples of the 2d plural: Cas. 765, quin agitis? quin datis? Men. 1000, quin me mittitis? Merc. 932, quin, pedes, vos in curriculum coniecit? Stich. 138, quin vos capitis condicionem?

b) Questions introduced by *etiam*. The few instances of this formula all seem to involve impatience: Asin. 714, etiam tu istunc amoves? Cure. 41, etiam taces? So also Pers. 152; Trin. 514; 790; Cure. 189, etiam dispertimini? Most. 383, etiam vigilas? 937, etiamne aperis? Pers. 275, scelerate, etiam respicis? 413; 542; Poen. 431; H. T. 235, etiam caves? Phor. 542, etiam tu hinc abis? Ad. 550, etiam taces?

c) Questions introduced by *non*: Amph. 700, non taces? So also Asin. 931; Bacch. 470; 627; Cure. 712; Men. 1026; Merc. 211; 484; 754; Most. 734; Asin. 476, non audes mihi subvenire? Men. 516, non tu abis? So also Merc. 757; Pseud. 1196; Stich. 603; M. G. 318, non iubes? And. 743, non mihi respondes? H. T. 919, non tu te cohibes? non te respicis? Phor. 987, non taces? so also 1004; 849, non manes? Ad. 781, non manum abstines? Plural: Ad. 942, non omittitis?

d) Questions introduced by *-ne*: Amph. 518, abin e conspectu meo? Similarly 857; Aul. 660; Bacch. 1168; 1176; Cas. 302; Merc. 756; Most. 850; Pers. 671; Trin. 457; 989; Asin. 939, iuben hanc abscedere? M. G. 315; Most. 660, dicisne? Pers. 412, accipin argentum? 792; And. 317, abin in malam rem? 337, fugin hinc? Eun. 651, in hinc? 861? Plural: Cure. 311, datin isti sellam? properatin ocus? Truc. 631, datin soleas? atque me intro actutum ducite!

In most of the examples in the foregoing categories, the present indicative refers to future time. These examples, therefore, might have been classified under the use of the present for the future. But their imperative equivalence seemed to call for the separate classification here given.

e) Without particle, Trag. incert. 34, itis, paratis?

Questions equivalent to the hortatory subjunctive, etc.:

a) In self-exhortations, Asin. 291, quin ego iubeo? Aul. 816, quin dico? Merc. 910, quin ornatum hunc reicio? Rud. 586, quin abeo in Veneris fanum? Phor. 209, quin abeo?

b) Hortatory, Asin. 680, quin ad hunc adgredimur? Cas. 854, quin imus ergo? Men. 247, quin domum redimus? Merc. 582, quin ergo imus atque obsonium curamus? 773, quin abimus? Pseud. 1048.

c) Jussive, Cure. 251, quin depromuntur quae opus sunt?

7. **The conative present.** Instances of this probably do not occur in Early Latin, though Capt. 232, quod volunt, dum id impetrant, boni sunt, is sometimes cited as an example of the usage.

THE IMPERFECT INDICATIVE.¹

The Indo-European imperfect indicative transferred to the past the kind of action denoted by the present from which it was formed. Some present formations designated progressive action; others momentary (aoristic) action; cf. p. 10. Hence some imperfects designated progressive action in past time; others denoted momentary action in the past, and were equivalent to aorists. Examples of these last are seen in the Greek *ἔφη*, *ἴσαν*, *ἔτην*, *ἐνεόμην*; Brugmann, Gr. Gramm.³, p. 487.

The imperfect indicative formation of Indo-European has disappeared in Latin and has been supplanted by a new imperfect in *-bam* (an aorist formation — *bhūām* — from the root *bhe-*), which, however, seems to have inherited the functions of the Indo-European imperfect. In Latin accordingly we find imperfect indicatives of both types: progressive and aoristic. Of these two general values, the progressive is by far the more prevalent. From it also have developed other functions, — particularly the customary and iterative uses.

CLASSIFICATION OF IMPERFECT USES.²

1. **The imperfect indicative represents an action as in process, as going on, in past time** (Progressive imperfect). Examples: Amph. 199, (quom pugnabant maxume) ego tum fugiebam maxume; 251;

¹ Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 145 ff.; Wheeler, The Imperfect Indicative in Early Latin, Am. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 163 ff.; The Syntax of the Imperfect Indicative in Early Latin, Classical Philology, i, p. 357 ff.; Blase, Studien und Kritiken zur lat. Syntax, 1904, p. 1 ff.; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino, 1888, p. 8 ff.; Wimmerer, Zum Indikativ im Hauptsatz irrealer Bedingungsperioden, Wiener Studien, xxvii, p. 260 ff.; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik⁴, p. 485 f.; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 268; 302-6; 310-14; Brugmann, Kurze Vergl. Gramm., p. 573 f.

² I am greatly indebted to the very complete collection of examples contained in the paper of Wheeler in Classical Philology, i, p. 380 ff. My treatment also, in the

603, prius multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adveneram; 1067, ardere censui aedis; ita tum confulgebant; so 1096; Aul. 427, in aedibus quid tibi erat negoti ('what were you doing?'); 550, pol ego te ut accusem merito meditabar; 625, semul radebat pedibus terram et croceibat; 827, iam ut eriperes apparabas; so also Epid. 409; And. 656; Aul. 706, me conlocavi in arborem indeque exspectabam; so also Poen. 1391; And. 435; And. Alt. Ex. 1; Eun. 743; Enn. Ann. 55. 12; Bacch. 286, is nostrae navi lembus insidias dabat; 297; 983, lacrimans tacitus auscultabat; Capt. 491, alii parasiti obambulabant in foro; 913, illum formidabam; ita frendebat dentibus; Cas. 178, ibam ad te; so also Cas. 593, ad te hercle ibam commodum; Epid. 218, et cum ea tibicinae ibant quattuor; Enn. Sota, 534; Lucil. 382; Cas. 432, ut trepidabat! ut festinabat! 433, ut sussultabat! 577, quid agis? : te ecastor praestolabar; so also Epid. 221; Cist. 566, iam perducebam illam ad me suadela mea; 723, quid quaeritabas? Epid. 214, obviam occurrebant suis amatoribus; 215, eos captabant; 216, sub vestimentis habebant retia; so also Merc. 360, nequiquam abstrusam habebam; Pseud. 676; Naev. Trag. 54; Lucil. 4; Epid. 482, hanc filius meus deperibat; Men. 29, Tarenti ludi forte erant quom illuc venit; 419, tibi advorsabar; Men. 1053, tu clamabas deum fidem; 1116, nam tunc dentes mihi cadebant primulum; 563, pallam ad phrygionem ferebat; Merc. 43, res ad illam abibat; 45; M. G. 100, is amabat meretricem; so also And. 88; Hec. 114; M. G. 1336, temptabam spirarent annon; Most. 961, quis istaec faciebat? Poen. 1179, omnis odor complebat; Pseud. 800, cur sedebas? so also Rud. 846; Cato, Jord. p. 36, 2; Calp. Piso, Peter, p. 84, 5; Rud. 519, eas res agebam commodum; 543, iam postulabas te totam Siciliam devoraturum; cf. Stich. 559; Rud. 1123, dudum dimidiam petebas partem; Stich. 328, quid me velles visebam; 365, commodum sese sol superabat; Trin. 212, omnes mortales hunc aiebant Calliclem indignum civitate hac esse; 901, ubi ipse erat? : bene rem gerebat; 910, atque modo vorsabatur mihi in labris; 926, quid ille mihi latitabat? 1100, thensaurum eefodiebam; Truc. 197, nam lavabat; Plaut. Frag. 82, tunc

main, follows Wheeler's; but I have omitted in this connection all consideration of the imperfect indicative in dependent clauses. A careful examination of the material showed that subordinate clauses exhibit no uses not exemplified in independent sentences. Full material illustrative of the use of the imperfect in dependent sentences is given below in the chapter on "The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses."

papillae primulum fraterculabant — illud volui dicere: sororiabant; And. 108, curabat una funus; 533, te ipsum quaerebam; so also H. T. 844; Eun. 1065; Phor. 472; Ad. 461; H. T. 126, pro se quisque sedulo faciebant; 292, anus subtemen nebat; praeterea una ancillula erat; ea texebat; 366, haec arte tractabat virum; 758, te mi ipsum iam dudum optabam dari; 781; 907, Clinia haec fieri videbat; Eun. 86, quis hic loquitur? tun hic eras? quid stabas hic? so also Ad. 901, tu hic eras? Eun. 323, id stomachabar modo; 378, quid agis? iocabar; 620, id faciebat retinendi illius causa; 1000, iam diu aliquam causam quaerebat; Phor. 52, ego obviam conabar tibi; 573, quid illi tam diu commorabare? 614, id cum hoc agebam commodum; Hec. 294; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3, 2, in auream molabat victimam pulchram; 4, 2, noctu Troiade exhibant; so 5, 3; Com. 114, tantum ibi molae crepitum faciebant, tintinnabant compedes; Enn. Ann. 28, 9, semita nulla viam stabilibat; 55, 8, certabant, urbem Romam vocarent; 93, 1, mandebat hominem: heu! quam crudeli condebat membra sepulcro! 107, aquila volabat; 140, 4, omne arbustum sonabat fremitu; 320, iam cata signa fera e sonitum dare voce parabant; 321, olli cernebant magnis de rebus; 351, navibus explebant sese terrasque replebant; 359, cum saevo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat; 400, ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni; 437, Massili-portabant iuvenes ad litora -tanais; Enn. Trag. 9, ita magni fluctus eiciebantur; 107, his erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater; 110, ignotus iuvenum coetus alterna vice inibat: 396, cubitis pinsibant humum; Acc. 34, fulmen, flammam ostentabat; Trag. Incert. Ribb. p. 273, 7, Priamus ecsacrificabat hostiis; p. 282, 3, trepidus hortabar fugam; Turp. 58, sperabam consilia nostra dividiæ tibi non fore; 147, misero mihi mitigabat sandalio caput; Afran. 140, res tempus locus simul otium hortabatur; 151, quod vitae studium mihi supponebas? Com. Incert. Ribb. 32, sibi cum tetulit coronam, tibi ferebat; Lucil. 80, mantica cantheri costas gravitate premebat; 112, 1, expirans animam pulmonibus aeger agebat; 127, 2, illum sumina ducebant; 171, ante fores quidam grandaevos gemebat; 186, circum impluvium ciner pluebat; 294, Scipiadae magno improbus obiebat Asellus; 519, di redditum talem portendebant; 749, hoc pretium atque reddebamus honorem; Cass. Hem. Peter, p. 72, 29, mulier cantabat et cymbalissabat; C. Gracchus, Meyer, p. 234, is in lectica ferebatur.

2. The imperfect often denotes, not an act in process, but a continuing state or condition. This use is closely connected with that already considered and is obviously but another phase of it. Thus certain verbs by their very nature are incapable of indicating an act as in process. Verbs like 'walk,' 'run,' 'sigh,' 'rain,' 'show,' 'fight,' etc. easily lend themselves to the idea of progression; but verbs like 'know,' 'believe,' 'fear,' etc. do not naturally denote an act going on; they denote rather a continuous state, — an act that endures rather than progresses. Such verbs stand frequently in the imperfect in Latin where in English we more commonly use the simple past. Examples:

a) *scibam, nescibam*, Amph. 22, etsi pro imperio vobis quod dictum foret scibat facturos; 385, scibam nullum esse nobis nisi me servom Sosiam; As. 300; Aul. 754; Bacch. 676; Poen. 509; Pseud. 499; 500; 501; Trin. 657; H. T. 309; Eun. 113; 155; 736; 1004; Phor. 529; 582; Acc. 37; Ribb. Trag. p. 285, 87; Turp. 16; Cass. Hem. Peter, p. 70, 7; cf. Eun. 1089, isti te ignorabant.

b) *censebam*: Aul. 667, Fide censebam maxumam multo fidem esse; As. 385; Bacch. 342, censebam me efugisse a vita marituma; Men. 605; 636; 1072; 1136; Merc. 196; 815; Pers. 171; 415.

c) *putabam*: And. 91, spectatum satis putabam; 113; cf. Amph. 1095, aedis primo ruere rebamur; And. 110, sic cogitabam.

d) *credebam*: Amph. 597, neque credebam primo mihimet Sosiae; Merc. 212; Pers. 477; Rud. 1186; H. T. 785; Hec. 713; Ad. 693.

e) *videbar*: Enn. Epich. 499, nam videbar somniare me lecto esse mortuom; Ann. 28, 7; Turp. 151.

f) Other verbs: Asin. 315, ego mirabar; so Phor. 490; Ad. 642; And. 175; Peter 73, 27; Asin. 392, quid quaeritas? : Demaenetum volebam; so 395; 452; Lucil. 313; Bacch. 190; Most. 9; Trin. 195; Aul. 178, praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire; Phor. 117, illam ducere cupiebat et metuebat absentem patrem; Men. 420; Truc. 185; Eun. 433; 514, ita tum erat suspicio; Bacch. 683, Bacchidem suspicabar; Capt. 662, non occatorem dicere audebas? Cas. 674, peccavi: illuc dicere volebam; 702; Epid. 138, desipiebam mentis, quom illa scripta mittebam; Merc. 247, quo magis cura cruciabar; And. 60, gaudebam; Ad. 152; Eun. 587; And. 96, id mihi placebat; Stich. 329, me quidem harum miserebat; Acc. 355; Eun. 1013, an paeni-

tebat flagiti? Hec. 806, denique hercle iam pudebat; Ad. 274; 150, iam omnium taedebat; Phor. 642, a primo insanibat; Hec. 177, primos dies bene conveniebat inter eas; 651, hunc videre optabamus diem; Phor. 83, serviebat lenoni; Bacch. 959, iam duo restabant fata tunc; Phor. 85; Bacch. 12, Praenestinum opino esse, ita gloriosus erat; And. 62, sic vita erat.

3. The imperfect is frequently used to denote a customary action (Customary Imperfect). This use apparently develops from the progressive function of the imperfect. An act that goes on permanently tends to become habitual. Examples: As. 142, sordido vitam oblectabas pane; 143, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias; 207, tum mihi aedes quoque adridebant, quom ad te veniebam; 209, in meo ore usque eratis, meo de studio studia erant vostra omnia, usque adhaerebatis . . . quod volueram faciebatis, quod volebam fugiebatis . . . neque conari id facere audebatis; 889, ille suppilabat me, quod ancillas suspicabar; Bacch. 421, eademne erat disciplina tibi, quom tu adulescens eras? 426 f.; 429; 438; Cist. 18, raro dabat quod biberem, id merum infuscabat; Epid. 135, illam amabam olim; 587, cur me patrem vocabas? Men. 717, omnia mala ingerebat quemquam aspexerat; 1122, uno nomine ambo eratis? : minime, nam mihi hoc erat quod nunc est, Menaechmo; illum tum vocabant Sosiclem; M. G. 61, rogitabant: "hicine Achilles est?" 835, nam nimis calebat, amburebat gutturem; 849, mihi imperabat, ego promebam; 850; 854, ea saepe deciens complebatur; 856; Most. 153, victitabam volup; disciplinae aliis eram, optumi quisque expetebant a me doctrinam sibi; 731, immo vita antehac erat; Pers. 649, servi liberique amabant; Pseud. 1171, ego eram domi imperator summus; 1181; Trin. 503, ubi usus nil erat dicto 'spondeo' dicebat; Plautus, Fr. 24, nam me puero venter erat solarium; And. 58, horum nil studebat; 74, primo haec pudice vitam agebat; 83 ff.; 107; 109; H. T. 102, cottidie accusabam; 110, non amor operam dabam; 988; Eun. 118, sororem plerique esse credebant meam; 397, vel rex semper maxumas mihi agebat, quidquid feceram; 407; Phor. 87, nos otiosi operam dabamus Phaedriae; 363, ruri fere se continebat; ibi agrum colendum habebat; saepe mihi narrabat; 789; Hec. 60, vel hic Pamphilus iurabat quotiens! 157; 426, olim te causae impellebant leves; Cato, Agr. Proem. 2, virum bonum quom laudabant, ita

laudabant; 3, amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur; fr. Jord. p. 29, 3, mulieres nostrae capillum cinere unctitabant; p. 35, 1, interea unamquamque turmam temptabam; quid facere possent spectabam; si quis strenue fecerat, donabam honeste, atque in contione laudabam; 39, 8, quom Romam veniebant, prorsus devortebantur ad amicos; p. 64, 2; p. 82, 10; 11; p. 83, 2; 3; Enn. Ann. 191, noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem; Trag. 370; Ambr. 495; Turp. 21; Lucil. 691, 'calix' per castra cluebat; CIL, i, 1011, ille meo officio adsiduo florebat ad omnis; Calp. Piso, p. 83, 29 (Peter), Flavivius scriptum faciebat; Asellio, p. 109, 9 (Peter), annales libri tantum modo ea demonstrabant; 110, 17; Rutil. Rufus, p. 123, 23 (Peter); Junius Pennus, p. 226 (Meyer), antea trossulos vocabant; C. Gracchus, p. 229, 3 (Meyer).

The prevalence of the customary usage leads also to the employment of the imperfect in the expressions, *solebam* and *mos erat*, Epid. 99, antehac aliis solebas dare consilia mutua; Phor. 89; Carbo, p. 282 (Meyer); Cato, fr. (Jord.), 83, 1, vestiri in foro honeste mos erat. Here the 'Aktionsart' is aoristic; it is illogical to speak of a custom as being customary.

4. The imperfect at times is used to denote an act that is persisted in by its author. This usage exhibits two or three different phases. Thus:

a) The idea may be that an act is kept up uninterruptedly, as Capt. 654, illic servom se adsimulabat, 'kept pretending'; Epid. 238, dissimulabam earum operam sermoni dare, 'kept pretending not to notice'; 420, ego med sic adsimulabam; quasi stolidum me faciebam; M. G. 463, sed quo modo dissimulabat! 'how capitally she kept up the pretence!' Pseud. 421.

b) The idea may be that an act is repeated (often insistently and vigorously) at frequent intervals within a short space of time (Iterative Imperfect). Some see in this use a resemblance to the customary imperfect, but the likeness is only superficial, for the customary imperfect always covers a long range of time, and denotes a fixed habit of daily life, whereas the iterative imperfect is limited to a brief period, and does not denote an habitual practice. Examples: As. 931, dissuadebam, 'I kept urging him not to;'; so 938, dicebam, pater, tibi ne matri consuleres male, 'I kept telling you, Father, not

to, etc.; 'Capt. 917, coquom percontabatur possentne seriae fervere; Epid. 58, ad me ab legione epistulas mittebat; 239, nec satis exaudibam, nec sermonis fallebar tamen. To understand the true character of this passage, it will help to give another of similar meaning, but affirmative in form, since the idiom probably arose in positive sentences, and the negative disguises its real nature. The Epid. passage I conceive to be modelled on something like, *amicus meus omnia exaudibat, ego autem sermonis fallebar*, in the sense, 'my friend kept hearing everything that was said, but I kept missing snatches of the talk;' the passage under discussion is simply a negative example of the idiom. Men. 483, *mulier quidquid dixerat, idem ego dicebam*; Merc. 216, *quin quidque ut dicebam, mihi credebat*; so 217; 631, *promittebas te os sublinere meo patri*; M. G. 1410, *ita ancilla dicebat mihi*; Poen. 478, *eo praesternebant folia . . .*; in *fundas visci indebant grandiculos globos*; i.e. the army as a whole kept doing these things; 486, *ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam*. *Eum* here is, of course, indefinite. A passive metaphrase may make the relation clearer: 'Whoever fell was in each case immediately dispatched by me.' Rud. 540, *tibi auscultavi, tu promittebas mihi illi esse quaestum maxumum*; *ibi me conruere posse aiebas ditias*; Amph. 383, *Amphitruonis te esse aiebas Sosiam*, may also be of the same nature,—'kept maintaining.' Truc. 506, *quin ubi natust, machaeram et clupeum poscebat sibi*; Hec. 802, *ut quisque venerat, accedebam*; Scipio Min. (Meyer), p. 214, *haec cum mihi quisquam narrabat, non poteram animum inducere*.

c) In the passages cited under *a*) and *b*) we have the reiterated act of the same person. Closely related are those instances in which we have, not the reiterated act of a single person, but the same act repeated by a succession of persons, as, for example, by the individuals of a group; as, Hec. 805, *omnes negabant*, i.e. the act of denial was repeated by one after another; so probably in Epid. 603, *adulescentem equidem dicebant emisse*, i.e. the statement was repeated by one and another (the regular force of 'they' in 'they say'); Poen. 483, *quemquem visco offenderant, tam crebri ad terram reccidebant quam pira*; i.e. the act of falling was repeated by one man after another.

5. The aoristic use of the imperfect (see p. 26). All recognize the

existence of this usage, but there is much difference of opinion as to the range of its occurrence. J. Schneider, *De temporum apud priscos Latinos usu*, p. 17, holds that the imperfect and perfect were used promiscuously of aoristic acts. Wheeler, *Classical Philology*, i. p. 389, on the other hand, limits the aoristic imperfect mainly to verbs of saying. Similar is the attitude of Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 485. An examination of the complete material belonging to the problem will, I believe, convince all that Schneider's view is untenable. At the same time I have felt compelled to recognize more instances of the aoristic imperfect than do either Wheeler or Schmalz. Yet the great limitation of the usage is obvious. Examples:

a) *aibam*: Amph. 807, te dormire aibas; As. 442, aibat reddere; so also Capt. 561; 676; Cas. 279; Cist. 143; 585; 607; Cure. 488; 582; Epid. 254; Men. 532; 936; 1046; 1141; Merc. 635; 637; 638; 765; 766; 804; M. G. 66; 1107; Most. 806; 1002; 1027; 1028; Poen. 464; 900; Pseud. 650; 1083; 1118; Rud. 307; 1130; Stich. 391; Trin. 428; 875; 944; 956; 986; 1140; True. 757; And. 930; 932; H. T. 960; Phor. 572; Hec. 238; Ad. 561; Titin. 63; Lucil. 381, 2.

Barring a few examples, all of these are taken as aoristic by Wheeler, *op. cit.* p. 389. I cannot find that any of them show decisive marks of any of the types of imperfect that we have recognized above. In the absence of a perfect of *aio* the imperfect seems to have assumed its functions. It is worthy of note that verbs of saying by their very nature do not readily lend themselves to imperfect uses. Thus while *dico* in Plautus is used over 200 times in the perfect, it occurs but ten times in the imperfect. It is small wonder then that the imperfect forms of *aio* have aoristic function.

b) *negabas*: Men. 729, at mihi negabas dudum surrupuisse te; Pseud. 1314, at negabas daturum esse te; Hec. 538, nam negabas posse te pati. Wheeler takes all these as progressive. But I can see no trace of action going on in any of these examples. The act certainly is not one in process. It is true that in English we can translate these by 'you were denying,' 'you were saying that . . . not.' But I am inclined to believe that such expressions are purely phraseological with us. 'You were saying' seems to me to carry no

implication of action in process, and to be as good a rendering of *modo dixisti* as of *modo dicebas*. If that is true, there is need of caution in making the English translation a test of the 'Aktionsart.'

c) *eras, erat*.¹ It is so difficult for me to see any notion of continued action in the imperfect of *sum* that I have unhesitatingly classed as aoristic nearly all of the instances of *eram* and its compounds. Thus: Amph. 429, *cadus erat vini, inde implevi hirneam*; here *erat* seems to me of the same nature as *implevi*; cf. Wheeler, op. cit. p. 374. Further examples are: Amph. 1009, (Naucrates) in *navi non erat*; As. 927, *modo quom dieta in me ingerebas, odium, non uxor, eram*. In these the idea corresponding to a 'wasn't being' seems very inappropriate. The obvious force of the verb is a simple past. Similarly with the following, which I shall not stop to discuss in detail: Aul. 375, *cara omnia, atque eo fuerunt cariora, aes non erat*; Bacch. 563; Capt. 273, *non fuit molesta servitus, nec mihi secus erat quam si, etc.*; Cas. 531; 882; 914; Men. 59, *ei liberorum nisi divitiae nihil erat*; 1117, *vos tum patri filii quot eratis? . . . uter eratis, tun an ille maior?* 1120; 1131; 1135; Merc. 845; M. G. 99; 181; 755, *sat erat*; 848; 853; 1323; 1430; 1431; Most. 788, *seni non erat otium, id opperitus sum*; Pers. 262; Poen. 1069; 1180; Pseud. 799; Rud. 49; 269, *aequius erat*; 502; 841, *quin occidisti? : gladius non erat*; 1253; Stich. 539, *fuit olim senex; ei filiae duae erant; . . . erant minori illi adulescenti fidicina et tibicina; sed ille erat caeleps senex*; Trin. 976, *postquam me aurum ferre dixi, tu factus Charmides; prius non eras, quam auri feci mentionem*; Truc. 719; And. 86; H. T. 201; 203; 629; Eun. 97, *ita res erat, faciundum fuit*; 345; 423; 569; 681; 736, *nonne id sat erat?* 841; Phor. 36; 654; 768, *sat erat*; 945; 1012; 1023; Hec. 283; 340; Ad. 234; 494; 716; Enn. Ann. 155, 4; Acc. 320; Cn. Gellius (Peter), p. 94, 23.

d) Compounds of *sum*: *poterat*: Aul. 294, *quid hic non poterat de suo opsonari?* M. G. 911; Pers. 59, *neque eos quisquam poterat vincere*; And. 792; H. T. 785; Hec. 375; cf. Rud. 600, *neque eas eripere quibat*; *aderat*: Epid. 612, *ibi aderat una Apocides*; Poen. 1178; Phor. 99; 105; 858; Hec. 561; *inerat*: Eun. 584, *ibi inerat*

¹ Note that by origin *eram* is not an imperfect, but an aorist, like the formative element *-bam* (see above, p. 26).

pictura; Naev. Bell. Pun. 20; *deerat*: Phor. 299, non ratio, verum argentum deerat.

e) *oportebat*: Men. 195, si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abrep-tum; H. T. 536, haec facta ab illo oportebat.

f) Barring a few 'shifted imperfects,' for which see below, there remain only the following instances in the entire range of Early Latin which have not already been considered. None of them seem to me to fall under any of the previous categories, but to be aoristic. They are: Aul. 179, itaque abibam invitus; Bacch. 673, quid igitur stulte, quoniam occasio fuit, sic hoc digitulis duobus sumebas prioribus? 788, orabat quod istic esset scriptum foret ut fieret; Capt. 504, vix ex gratulando miser eminebam; Cist. 568, eam suam esse filiam adiurabat mihi; Merc. 190, quin apstrudebas? 983 a, vacuum esse his decebat noxiis; Pseud. 421, iam pridem sensi et subolebat mihi; 798, si arbitrabare, cur conducebas? Truc. 332, non tibi dicebam 'i' modo? 333, quid iam revocabas? 813, vir erat, plus valebat; And. 89, (gaudebam); alio die quaerebam: comperiebam nil ad Pamphilum attinere; 490, non imperabat coram; Eun. 111, matris nomen dicebat ipsa; . . . mercator hoc addebat; 533, Thais orabat ut redires; Phor. 595, gaudebat, me laudabat, quaerebat senem dis gratias agebat; 652, mihi venibat in mentem eius incommodum; Hec. 94, illi haud licebat nisi praefinito loqui; 498, quam ob rem te orabam? Ad. 809, tu illos duo olim pro re tollebas tua; Naev. Praetext. 8, proveniebant oratores novi, stulti adulesculentuli; Cass. Hem. (Peter), p. 73, 28, ille ita rationem reddebat; Calp. Piso (Peter), 83, 30, isque in eo tempore aedili curuli apparebat; CIL, i, 201, 6, animum nostrum non inducebamus ita facta esse.

6. Imperfects denoting a future from a past standpoint. Attention has already been called (p. 18) to the use of the present as future. Corresponding to that usage, we have in a few instances the imperfect denoting a future act from a past point of view. Thus: Merc. 884, quo nunc ibas? 981, ibat in exsulatum; Truc. 921, ego ad te ibam; so also, And. 581; Phor. 900, nos ad te ibamus; 902, quid ad me ibatis? Ad. 820, mane: scio; istuc ibam; Phor. 298, qua ratione inopem potius ducebat domum? 'was proposing to bring home'; Hec. 171, interea moritur cognatus senex; ea ad hos redibat lege hereditas; see Wheeler, Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 174.

7. The shifted imperfect. Wheeler (Class. Phil. i, p. 376) gives this name to those cases in which the imperfect indicative is equivalent to an imperfect subjunctive with present force, i.e. is equivalent to the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition in the present. But the examples which he cites in illustration of the usage fail in all but *one* instance to conform to his definition. The one instance is Lucil. 150, *nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset, hoc sat erat*, where *sat erat* is equivalent to *sat esset*. Wheeler's other examples (in independent sentences) are: Merc. 983, *etiam loquere larva? vacuum esse istac ted aetate his decebat noxiis*; M. G. 911, *bonus vates poteras esse*; Rud. 269, *ergo aequius vos erat candidatas venire hostiatusque*; H. T. 785, *scite poterat fieri*; M. G. 754, *quid opus fuit hoc sumptu nostra gratia? insanivisti hercle, nam idem hoc hominibus sat erat decem*. In all of these examples the imperfect refers to the past, — 'ought to have avoided,' 'ought to have come,' 'would have made a good prophet,' 'might have been nicely done.' We simply have a familiar Latin idiom, whereby in the case of certain verbs (*possum, decere, debere*, etc.) the Latin uses a past tense (perfect or imperfect) governing a *present infinitive*, where in English we use the *perfect infinitive*, as, 'you ought to have come'; 'you could have done this.' In this usage the Latin form of expression is strictly logical. As Blase well observes (*Studien und Kritiken*, p. 13), the peculiarity is in the English. In Wheeler's last example (M. G. 754), there is no peculiarity, however. The words are to be taken, I believe, in their literal meaning: 'you were crazy; there was enough here for ten men.'

FURTHER PECULIARITIES OF USAGE.

Imperfect for present. In the dramatists the speaker sometimes puts in the imperfect a thought which belongs to the present as well as the past and which in English we more commonly express by the present tense; as, As. 392, *quid quaeritas? :: Demaenetum volebam*; 394, *ubi est? :: ad tonsorem ire dixit . . . quid volebas? 452, si domi est, Demaenetum volebam*; Bacch. 189, *recte valet? :: istuc ex te volebam percontarier*; Most. 9, *hoccine volebas? Trin. 195, istuc volebam scire*; Cas. 674, *peccavi: illuc dicere volebam*; 702, *illud quidem volebam*; Truc. 719, *hicin tu eras? Phor. 858, tu quoque*

aderas? : : aderam; 945, tune is eras? Hec. 340, tun hic eras? so Ad. 901; And. 86, illi id erat nomen.

Imperfect with iam dudum, iam pridem, iam diu, with the force of the pluperfect. I have noted only the following instances in Early Latin: Men. 419, iam dudum tibi advorsabar; Poen. 1391, iam pridem scivi et expectabam (assuming that the force of *iam pridem* extends also to *expectabam*); Pseud. 421, iam pridem sensi et subolebat mihi; H. T. 758, te mi ipsum iam dudum optabam dari; Eun. 1000, iam diu aliquam causam quaerebat senex.

Imperfect of the immediate past. Wheeler (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 168; Classical Philology, i, p. 358) recognizes also as a subdivision of the progressive imperfect an imperfect of the immediate past, and, as a sub-type of that, an interrupted imperfect. Stich. 328 illustrates both these uses: ego quid me velles visebam; nam me quidem harum miserebat. Both *visebam* and *miserebat* refer to the immediate past, and in *visebam* the action is interrupted. In both cases the distinction is real, yet it can hardly be regarded as of vital syntactical importance.

The inceptive and conative imperfections. As Wheeler has shown (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 173), the inceptive force occasionally noticed in passages like Men. 1116, nam tunc dentes mihi cadebant primulum, "arises from the combination of tense and particle. No inceptive function can be proved for the tense alone." There are no certain cases, either, of the conative use in Early Latin (Wheeler, *ibid.* p. 179). In Epid. 215, eos captabant, the conative force lies in the meaning of the verb itself.

A review of the material under the foregoing categories substantiates the traditional definition of the imperfect indicative as the tense of description, as opposed to the perfect, the tense of narration. But it should be clearly borne in mind that the imperfect is the tense of description by virtue of its dominant progressive character. While, therefore, we may speak of a "descriptive imperfect," we should remember that it is but a common illustration of the basal progressive use.

In Latin, as in Sanskrit and Greek, the imperfect is frequently used in referring to occurrences within the recollection of the speaker

or of the speaker and the person addressed. This is sometimes called the "reminiscent imperfect." But again we have but a phase of the progressive use, and a perfectly natural one, since the visualizing tense of situation is by its nature adapted to the recital of personal experiences.

THE FUTURE INDICATIVE.¹

There are two future formations in Latin, one in *-am*, another in *-bo*. The former of these is an Indo-European subjunctive; the latter is a new formation (peculiar to Italic and Celtic), which, however, shares the functions of the future in *-am*. Both sets of forms exhibit clear traces of subjunctive influence. Thus we find a variety of uses strongly tinged with volitive meaning; while other uses seem to be developed from the pure future force inherent in one of the phases of the Indo-European subjunctive (see p. 152). There are traces too of optative functions, though these in all probability do not go back to any association of the *-am* subjunctive with optative functions, but are rather an outgrowth of the future force itself.

Another outgrowth of the pure future force is the gnomic or achronistic use. The so-called potential force recognized by some does not seem to rest upon any adequate foundation.

CLASSIFICATION OF FUTURE USES.

The following classification includes volitive, pure future, optative, and achronistic uses as its major categories. Under the volitive and pure future headings a number of minor categories will be considered. For the less usual types the material will be found fairly complete, viz. for the jussive, deliberative, optative, and achronistic uses. For the other and common categories the examples are drawn from two plays, the *Mostellaria* and the *Andria*.

I. Volitive uses of the future indicative. In the volitive forces of the future indicative the notion of willing is usually much less pronounced than in the volitive uses of the subjunctive. The first per-

¹ Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Sprache*, iii, p. 112 ff.; Neumann, H., *De futuri in priscorum Latinorum vulgari vel cotidiano sermone vi et usu*, 1888; Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, 1904, p. 72 ff.; Schneider, Jos., *De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, 1888, p. 18 ff.; Rodenbusch, *De temporum usu Plautino*, 1888, p. 37 ff.; Van Wijk, *Die altitalischen Futura*, *Indog. Forsch.* xvii, p. 465 ff.

son (usually singular) predominates. In a fair number of instances there is a clear idea of resolve or determination. In other cases (and these are much more numerous) the notion is merely of an intended course of action, including threats and promises. We have also permissive futures and futures denoting compliance or assent.

a) Resolves, e.g. *And.* 276, *non faciam*; 380, *quidvis patiar*; 384, *numquam faciam*; 415, *hoc agam*; 775, *non hercle faciet* ('he will not do it'); *Most.* 229, *venibit multo potius*; 238, *nam neque edes neque bibes*; 846, *errabo potius quam perductet*; 914, *numquam sinam*; 1133, *non enim ibis*.

b) Compliance, a yielding of the will of the speaker, as, *And.* 45, *dic quid est!:: ita faciam*; 388, *ducas volo hodie uxorem:: ducam*; 420, *neque erit usquam in me mora*; 597, *faciam hercle sedulo*; 681, *restituere locum!:: faciam*; 713, *veniam*; 739, *manebo*; *Most.* 246, *tibi adsentabor*; 398, *intro abi et tu!:: morigerae tibi erimus*; 401, *curabitur*; 661, *dicam*; 857, *haud usquam a pedibus apscedam tuis*; 898, *faciam*; 928, *faciam ut iubes*.

c) Commands (*Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus bei Plautus*, 1871, p. 23): *Amph.* 15, *ita huic facietis fabulae silentium itaque aequi et iusti hic eritis arbitri*; *Asin.* 373, *tu cavebis ne me attingas*; *Aul.* 401, *tu istum gallum, si sapis, glabriorem reddes*; *Bacch.* 48; *Cure.* 728, *tu, miles, aput me cenabis*; *Men.* 122, *malo cavebis, si sapis; virum observare desines*; 692, *non feres*; *Merc.* 584, *atque hercle invenies tu locum illi, si sapis*; *Most.* 75, *ne tu hercle praeterhac mihi non facies moram*; 515, *non me appellabis, si sapis*; *M. G.* 571, *ne tu hercle linguam comprimes posthac*; *Poen.* 675; 1036; *H. T.* 870, *cautim et paulatim dabis, si sapiēs*; 833, *tu hic nos opperibere*; *Hec.* 590, *haud facies, neque sinam*; *Stat.* 145, *qui sapiet, de me discet*; 176, *patiere quod dant quando optata non danunt*; *Afran.* 129, *me auctore, mater, abstinebis*; *Cato, Agr.* 14, 3, *quae opus sunt, dominus praebebit et ad opus dabit*; 90, *id ubi excluserit, deposito bene . . . postea magis depset*; *CIL*, i, 198, 8, *de hisce iudicium non fiet*.

It is a mistake to believe, as is sometimes done, that the future indicative, when used in this function, denotes *per se* any particular kind of command, either mild or peremptory. As a matter of fact it may denote any kind of command, either mild or peremptory. In this it is exactly like the jussive subjunctive and the imperative.

d) Deliberatives. All of the logical values of the deliberative subjunctive (see p. 228 ff.) may be expressed by the future indicative. Thus:

1) Inquiry after a command or advice, Merc. 915, paullisper mane! quid, manebo? M. G. 1242, adibon? Rud. 1370, propera!:: quid, properabo?

2) Duty or Fitness, Epid. 151, quid fiet illa fidicina? ('what's to be done?') So also Phor. 219; Ad. 288; 996; M. G. 973, quid illa faciemus? So also Eun. 837; Hec. 668; Most. 392, ubi ero? Rud. 189, hancine ego ad rem natam miseram me memorabo? 249, quo, amabo, ibimus? 251, sicine hic cum uvida veste grassabimur? 748, tunc . . . liberos parentibus sublectos habebis atque indigno quaestu conteres? 1140, idne habebit hariola? 1270, patri etiam gratulabor? Stich. 428, ad cenam ibon? 599, solus cenabo domi? Truc. 205, ibo igitur intro? 741, meane inimici mei bona istic caedent? And. 453, quem vocabo ad cenam meorum aequalium potissimum? 612, quid ego nunc dicam patri? negabon velle me ducere? H. T. 700, nam quo ore appellabo patrem? Phor. 536, itane hunc patiemur, Geta, fieri miserum? 538, quin beneficium rursum ei experiemur reddere? 917, nam quo redibo ore ad eam? Hec. 671, eho! an non alemus? prodemus potius? Cato (Jord.) fr. 23, 17, ea nunc derepente tanta beneficia, tantam amicitiam relinquemus? quod illos dicimus voluisse facere, id nos priores facere occupabimus?

3) Helplessness, Hec. 628, quid respondebo his? aut quo pacto hoc operiam? 516, quid agam? quo me vortam? quid viro respondebo?

4) True Deliberative, only Capt. 535, quid loquar? quid fabulabor? quid negabo? aut quid fatebor?

5) Repudiating Question or Exclamation, Men. 197, salta sic cum palla postea!:: ego saltabo! sanus hercle non es; M. G. 1021, quid! ego astabo hic tantisper frustra! Hec. 671, ego alam! Turp. 153, ego praestolabo illi ante ostium! Pseud. 847, tibi nummum dabo!

A few other examples are brought by some scholars under the head of the deliberative. Thus Bacch. 824, atqui iam dabis.:: dabo? And. 617, at iam expediam.:: expedit? H. T. 1012, nilo minus ego hoc faciam tamen.:: facies? are regarded by some as examples of the repudiating future. But these are rather scornful inquiries as

to the purpose or intention of the person addressed. They seem to me different from the examples which I have cited under the head of the repudiating future. Even less entitled to rank as deliberatives seem to me Bacch. 145, *tu amicam habebis?* Cure. 205, *quo usque ad hunc modum amore utemur subrepticio?* Rud. 817; Trin. 605.

e) Permissive uses, e.g. Most. 392, *cum hac, cum istac eris*; 884, *illi erunt bucaedae potius quam ego sim restio*; Cato, Agr. 147, *si non exportaverit, dominus vino quid volet faciet*.

f) Threats, e.g. Most. 4, *te ruri ulciscar*; 240, *nec recte si dixeris, vapulabis*; 384, *occidam patrem*; 386, *vos pro matula, habebo*; 587, *illunc nominabo*; 1114, *iam iubebo ignem circumdari*; 1167, *verberibus caedere pendens*; 1168, *interimam te*; And. 199, *te in pistrinum dedam*; 776, *hunc in viam provolvam*; 864, *ego te commotum reddam*; 866, *tibi ostendam erum quid sit pericli fallere*; 920, *ea quae non volt audiet*.

g) Promises, e.g. Most. 253, *dabo aliquid hodie peculi*; 359, *ego dabo ei talentum*; 387, *istum medicabo metum*; 388, *ego qui istaec sedem meditabor*; 580, *reddeturne faenus? :: reddet*; 612, *is tibi et faenus et sortem dabit*; 745, *e me nil sciet*; 1024, *non negabo et dabo*; 1131, *ibo pro te*; 1160, *sortem nos dabimus, nos conferemus*; And. 171, *sat est. curabo*; 327, *dabo operam*; 403, *curabitur*; 617, *at iam expediam*; *expedies?* 622, *iam aliquid dispiciam*; 684, *ubi erit, inventum tibi curabo*; 703, *hoc effectum reddam*; 898, *feram*.

Under the head of promises falls also the idiomatic use of *amabo* (Blase, *Archiv für lat. Lexikographie und Grammatik*, ix, p. 485; *Hist. Gramm.* iii, p. 115). *Amabo*, in the sense of "please" is a very common feature of comic diction, occurring some 90 times in Plautus and 11 times in Terence. The usage originated apparently in connection with imperatives. Thus *dic, amabo!* meant originally, "tell me! I will love you (for it)." When once it had established itself in this environment, it naturally extended to other combinations, particularly questions; but it also occurs occasionally in other connections. Examples:

1) With imperatives and equivalent subjunctives:

Present 2d singular, Cas. 137, *sine, amabo, ted amari*; 641, *obtine auris, amabo*; Men. 541, *amabo, mi Menaechme, inauris da*

mihi; 678, pallam illam, amabo, mihi eam redde; Eun. 838, vide, amabo.

Present 2d plural, Cist. 643, amabo, accurre; Stich. 752, date mi locum, ubi accumbam, amabo; Eun. 130.

Negative present, Amph. 540, noli, amabo, irasci; Cure. 137, ne plora, amabo; Poen. 370; Naev. Com. 82, cave (ne) cadas, amabo.

Future 2d singular, As. 939, de palla memento, amabo; Cas. 832; Titin. 109.

Jussive, Bacch. 44, id, amabo te, huic caveas; Rud. 427.

2) In questions, Cure. 110 b, amabo, quia vox sonat procul? Most. 343, quin, amabo, accubas? Poen. 263, eho, amabo, quid illo nunc properas? 399; H. T. 404, amabo, quid tibist? Titin. 80.

3) In other connections, M. G. 1084, iam iam sat amabost; Cist. 110, sed, amabo, tranquille; Truc. 873; Bacch. 1149; 1197.

The purely formulaic character of the expression is indicated by the fact that *te*, which logically should be present, is usually lacking. *Amabo* is regularly used only by women, addressing men, occasionally by men addressing women, never by men to men.

h) Announcements or declarations of intention. The volitional element here sinks to its lowest terms. Examples: Most. 82, nunc rus abibo; similarly, 317; 540; 849; And. 374; 594; 599; Most. 94, faciam ut credatis; 174, te donabo aliqui; 338, iam revortar; 344, dormiam; 405, hasce ego aedis ocludam; 426, ego ocludam . . . ludos faciam . . . concedam, hinc speculabor; 445, pultabo; 543, accedam atque appellabo; similarly, 689; 717; 566, occupabo adire; 614, feram, si quid datur; 683, te opperiar; so also And. 235; Most. 741, eloquar; so also, 945; And. Alt. Ex. 6; Most. 757, dicam; so also, 888; 931; And. 615; Most. 783, congrediar; 963, pergam percontarier; 1061, praeoccupabo atque anteveniam et foedus feriam; 1066, illum praestolabor; 1070, non illi extemplo hamum ostendam, sensim mittam lineam, dissimulabo me horum quicquam scire; 1074, adgrediar, appellabo; 1094, interim hanc aram occupabo; 1096, hic praesidebo; And. 48, rem omnem a principio audies et consilium cognosces; similarly 103; 579; 116, scies; so also, 585; 312, hunc ipsum orabo, huic supplicabo, amorem huic narrabo; 431, renuntiabo; 527, nunc Chremem conveniam, orabo gnato uxorem; 701, id faciam; 705, quid facies (inquiry after intention); 670, alia

adgrediemur via; 708, ego hanc visam; 715, iam hic adero; 734, ab dextera venire me adsimulabo; 893, quid dices mihi; 974, conloquar.

II. Pure future uses. As already stated, these apparently go back to the pure future use of the Indo-European subjunctive (see p. 154). We distinguish:

a) Expressions of expectation, e.g. Most. 98, haud aliter dicetis; 228, sat ero dives; 231, magis amabunt quom me videbunt; 383, pater aderit iam meus; 510, hanc conturbabunt fabulam; 776, quid mihi fiet? 870, probe tectum habebo; 882, mane castigabit eos; 997, verum iam scibo; 1077, Philolaches iam aderit; 1099, tanto condemnabo facilius; And. 112, quid hic mihi faciet? 247, nullon pacto adfinitatem effugere potero? 208, me aut erum pessum dabunt; 313, credo, impetrabo; 379, culpam in te transferet; tunc istae turbae fient; 389, cedo quid iurgabit tecum? 396, inveniet inopem; 398, aliam quaeret; 441, deinde desinet; 571, tibi generum firmum et filiae invenies virum; 674, geminas conficies nuptias; 773, si viderit, gnatum non dabit: tanto hercle magis dabit; 837, ubi causa erit adempta, desinent.

b) Predictions, e.g. Most. 18, eis paucas tempestates augebis numerum; 56, ita te forabunt; 196, te ille deseret aetate; 217, male querere; 559, tum facile vinces; 712, nil erit quod accusites; 1087, numquam edepol dabit; 1179, ibi poteris ulcisci probe; And. 389, reddes omnia consilia incerta; 395, propulsabo facile uxorem; dabit nemo.

c) Statements of what one knows is sure to happen, e.g. And. 178, numquam verbum fecit; at nunc faciet; 507, puerum huc deferent; 980, intus despondebitur; intus transigetur.

III. Optative uses. The future indicative is also used in wishes: Amph. 563, malum quod (= *aliquod*) tibi di dabunt; Pseud. 1130; As. 623, salve; dabunt di quae velitis vobis; Trin. 576, di fortunabunt vostra consilia: ita volo; Pers. 16, O Sagaristio, di ament te.: O Toxile, dabunt di quae exoptes; 205, Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt; Men. 278, Menaechme, salve.: di te amabunt; Rud. 107, at di dabunt.: quisquis es, magnum malum. Under this head falls also the formula, ita me amabit (amabunt): Capt. 877; Merc. 762, ita me amabit Iupiter, ut ego illud numquam dixi; Curc. 326, ita me amabit, quam ego amo, ut ego haud mentior; Truc. 276; Aul. 496; 761; Men. 278;

Poen. 439; 869; 1219; Most. 520, *ita me di amabunt, mortuom credidi expostulare*; Trin. 447; H. T. 463, *sic me di amabunt, ut me tuarum miseritumst fortunarum*; 749; Hec. 106.

Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, p. 73 f., denies the optative character of this usage. To his mind, *ita me amabit Iuppiter* is not equivalent in meaning to *ita me Iuppiter amet*, the former being rather merely an expression of confident assurance. But he does not mention, and apparently does not consider, all the material above cited. Passages like As. 623 and Pers. 16 seem to me decisive. I can account for the subjunctive in these only on the theory of attraction, *dabunt* being felt to be equivalent to an optative subjunctive. So also in Trin. 576, we cannot ignore the significance of *ita volo* following *di fortunabunt vostra consilia*.

IV. The achronistic use of the future indicative (Neumann, p. 57). The future indicative is occasionally used without reference to time, but to express a general truth belonging to all time (Schneider, p. 18; Blase, *Hist. Gramm.* p. 120), as, Most. 289, *pulchra mulier nuda erit quam purpurata pulchrior*; 1041, *qui homo timidus erit in rebus dubiis, nauci non erit*; Pers. 365, *virgo atque mulier nulla erit quin sit mala*; Amph. 173, *nec aequom anne iniquom imperet cogitabit*; Men. 90, *dum tu illi quod edit et quod potet praebeas, numquam fugiet; facile adservabis*; And. 10, *qui utramvis recte norit, ambas noverit*; Ad. 55, *qui mentiri aut fallere insuerit patrem tanto magis audebit ceteros*; 72, *ille quem beneficio adiungas praesens absensque idem erit*; Afran. 7, *haut facul, ut ait Pacuvius, femina invenietur bona*; Naev. Com. 90, *numquam quisquam amico amanti amica nimis fiet fidelis, nec nimis morigera et devota quisquam erit*; Lucil. 777 *nonnumquam dabit ipsa aetas quod prosit habendo*; Cato, Agr. 135, 3, *(fiscinae) optimae erunt Romae*.

V. The potential future. Some scholars (Blase, Neumann) recognize a so-called potential use of the future, designated also as "*Futurum der Wahrscheinlichkeit*" (Blase, p. 119). As examples of this usage are cited passages like Pseud. 677, *sed profecto hoc sic erit: centum doctum hominum consilia sola haec devincit dea Fortuna*; As. 734, *hic inerunt viginti minae*; Bacch. 273, *porro etiam ausculta pugnam quam voluit dare . . . em, accipitrina haec erit*; Cure. 473, *ibidem erunt scorta exoleta*; 493, *et quidem meminisse ego haec*

volam te; Epid. 291, quem hominem inveniēmus ad eam rem utilem? :: hic erit optumus; 658, memento suppetias mihi ferre. :: facile istuc erit; Pers. 437, cape hoc sis. :: nummi sescenti hic inerunt; 645, haec erit bono genere nata; Plaut. Frag. Incert. 123, tene crumnam! inerunt triginta minae; H. T. 1014, subditum ain tu? :: sic erit; similarly Eun. 1058; Phor. 801; Ad. 182.

But I can discover nothing potential about these expressions, which are typical of those usually referred to this class. They are idiomatic uses, to be sure, but their peculiarity is not connected with the potential. The tense in each of the foregoing passages seems to me to be a true future. Only, the idea is inexactly expressed. When in As. 734, for example, the speaker says, hic inerunt viginti minae, he means that the person addressed *will find* twenty minae in the bag when he comes to count the money. Similarly in the other passages above cited. See especially Sjögren, p. 109 ff., who shows the lack of ground for recognizing a potential future.

M. G. 395, narrandum ego istuc militi censebo, sometimes cited as a potential future, is probably to be taken as an illustration of formal assimilation of the tense of *censeo* to the time of *narrandum*. Logically, the idea would be expressed by *censeo*. An analogous case of attraction is seen in M. G. 651, plus dabo quam praedicabo ex me venustatis tibi, where logically the idea of *praedicabo* would be expressed by *praedicavi* or *praedico*. Trin. 606, non credibile dices, is regarded by Sjögren, p. 117, as an error for *dicis*; cf. also p. 233.

THE PERFECT INDICATIVE.¹

As in form, so in meaning the Latin perfect indicative represents both the Indo-European perfect and aorist. The force of the former is seen in the present perfect; that of the latter in the historical perfect.

A. PRESENT PERFECT.

Besides its common function of denoting an action completed at the present time, the present perfect also denotes the continued state resulting from a completed act, as in *memini*, *odi*, *novi*, *perii*, *occidi*, *interii*. Most of these are so common as to call for no special

¹ Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 160 ff.; Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 314 ff.

citations. Less frequent in this use are: *actum est* (Cist. 685; Pseud. 85; 1221; Stich. 751; And. 465; Eun. 54); Rud. 683, *acta haec res est*; Most. 365, *absumpti sumus*; Amph. 1058, *corrupta sum atque absumpta sum*; M. G. 172, *occisi sumus*; Bacch. 161; M. G. 202, *astitit severo fronte curam cogitans*.

The perfect also, like the present, serves as future, especially in the apodosis of conditional sentences, e.g. Amph. 428, *victus sum si dixeris*; Asin. 360, *si ille argentum prius adfert, continuo nos exclusi sumus*; Epid. 82, *nisi quid in tete auxili est, absumptus es*; M. G. 163, *disperiistis, ni mulcassitis*; Trin. 595, *id si alienatur, actum est de collo meo*; Capt. 539; Eun. 1064, *si offendero, periisti*; And. 961, *immortalitas partast, si nulla aegritudo intercesserit*. — As future perfect: Most. 827, *boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice*.

At times also the perfect has an achronistic force, as, Epid. 425, *nihil amicost opportuno amicius; sine tuo labore quod velis actumst tamen*; Trin. 308, *si animus hominem pepulit, actumst*; Capt. 256, *saepe is cautor captus est*; Ad. 855.

Referable to an original present perfect use is probably also the type represented by the Virgilian *fuimus Troes, Ilium fuit*, e.g. Pseud. 311, *ilico vixit amator, ubi supplicat*; Pers. 637, *omne ego pro nihilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit*.

Following the analogy of *novi*, we find also the perfect *scivi* with the force of 'I know,' e.g. Poen. 724, *scitis? :: scivimus*; so 725. Similarly *nescivi*, Capt. 265, *si quid nescivi* (Acidalius, *nescibo*), *id nescium tradam tibi*; Poen. 629; Pseud. 977.

B. HISTORICAL PERFECT.

Besides the ordinary uses of the historical perfect, we have to note especially the use of the perfect indicative as the equivalent of the pluperfect subjunctive: M. G. 803, *non potuit reperire lepidiores duas*; 1076, *hanc vendere potuit operam*; Most. 573, *numquam potuisti magis opportunus advenire*; 1162, *non potuit venire orator magis impetrabilis*; Poen. 583, *non potuisti adducere homines*; Pseud. 669, *non potuit opportunius advenire*; 793; Stich. 301, *qui potuit scire?* Truec. 635, *quo pacto excludi potui planius?* Curc. 110 b, *canem esse hanc quidem magis par fuit*; Epid. 388, *fuit conducibile hoc quidem mea sententia*; M. G. 725, *aequom fuit deos*

paravisse uno exemplo ne omnes viverent; Pseud. 688, aurichaleo contra non carum fuit; M. G. 730, itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit; 1112, tu quidem ad equas fuisti scitus admissarius; Truc. 140, si rem servassem, fuit ubi negotiosus essem.

Common to both the present and historical perfects is the frequent use in Early Latin of the auxiliary *fui* instead of *sum*. But this peculiarity belongs rather to the formal than the syntactical field. See Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre der lat. Spr. iii, p. 135 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 173.

THE PLUPERFECT INDICATIVE.¹

It is uncertain whether the pluperfect indicative is a descendant of the Indo-European aorist or is a new formation by proportional analogy, *videram* being formed from *videro* (which is Indo-European) after the relationship between *ero* and *eram*. At all events the notion of priority in past time inhering in this tense in classical Latin cannot have been original. In Indo-European there were no tenses for relative time. The time-sphere of every tense was present, past, or future with reference only to the speaker's (or thinker's) present, not with reference to any other past, or future, act or state. Originally in Indo-European, priority in past time must have been indicated by the aorist. But the aorist did not of itself denote prior action in past time. This relation was purely a suggestion of the context. So in Latin the perfect, not only originally, but occasionally in the classical period as well, served as the less accurate tense of prior past action, e.g. Cist. 611, quam duxit uxorem, ex ea natast haec; Livy, quosque fors obtulit, interfecere. So regularly with *postquam*, *ubi*, *ut*, etc. But for the more precise designation of prior action in past time, the pluperfect came to be used. At first this tense could have been no more pluperfect in character than the aorist, but in time it was differentiated. To what extent its original aorist character still persists in Early Latin will be considered below.

¹ Blase, Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts im Lateinischen, 1894; Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 210 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, ii, p. 317 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Grammatik, p. 569 ff.; 576; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plantino, 1888, p. 27 ff.; J. Schneider, De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1888, p. 28 ff.

CLASSIFICATION OF PLUPERFECT USES.

1. The pluperfect denotes an action prior to another past act or to a past point of time *explicitly mentioned* in the immediate context, e.g. Asin. 211, quod iusseram, quod volueram faciebatis; Aul. 427; Bacch. 959, iam duo restabant fata tunc nec magis id ceperam oppidum; Capt. 305, me, qui liber fueram, servom fecit; Cas. 580; 912, non fuit quicquid holerum, nisi, quidquid erat, calamitas numquam attigerat; Cure. 602, pater istum meus gestitavit; mater ei utendam dederat; Men. 29, Tarenti ludi forte erant; mortales multi conveniant; 483, mulier quidquid dixerat, idem dicebam; 717, omnia mala ingerebat quemquam aspexerat; 986, postquam conlocavi ut iusserat; M. G. 26, ei pugno praeferregisti brachium. :: at indiligenter iceram; Most. 185, quod promiseram perdidisti; Poen. 63, pollinctor dixit qui pollinxerat; 483, quemquem offenderant, reccidebant; 486, ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam; Pseud. 53, prius quam abiit, xv minas dederat; 676, cuncta in ordine, ut volueram, habebam; 1091, attulit symbolum qui convenerat; 1117; Rud. 47, flocci non fecit fidem neque quod iuratus adulescenti dixerat; 59, adulescenti qui puellam ab eo emerat, ait sese velle votum solvere; 65, ad portum adulescens venit; navis longe in altum abscesserat; 1186; 1253; Stich. 542, erant minori illi fidicina et tibicina, peregre advexerat; 540, erant duobus nuptae fratribus; Trin. 161, alium me fecisti; alius veneram; 827, placido te usus sum; hanc tuam gloriam iam ante acceperam; 1056, talentum quoi dederam, talento inimicum emi; 1083, quis emit? :: Callicles, quoi tuam rem commendaveras; Truc. 648, argentum debebat qui ovis erat mercatus; 821, loquere quis stupraverit :: Diniarchus, quoi desponderas; And. 238, uxorem dederat dare; nonne oportuit praescisse me ante? 241, Chremes, qui denegarat, id mutavit? H. T. 600, fuit quaedam anus; huic haec argenti mille dederat mutuom; 661, quid renuntiavit? :: fecisse id quod iusseram; Eun. 114, addebat, e praedonibus unde emerat se audisse abreptam e Sunio; 125, miles qui me amare oceperat in Cariamst profectus; 234, conveni quendam hominem qui abligurrierat; 397, rex semper maxumas mihi agebat quidquid egeram; 404, si quando odium ceperat; 412, unus tamen impense (invidit) elephantis quem praefecerat; 428, tuomne hoc dictum erat? vetus

credidi. : : audieras? 451, bene dixi ac mi istuc non in mentem venerat. : : ridiculum; non enim cogitaras; 633, praeterii imprudens villam. longe abieram, quom sensi; 654, quam erae dederat, virginem vitiavit; 672, si cessassem, non offendissem; ita iam adornarat fugam; Phor. 84, neque (erat) quod daretur quicquam; id curarant patres; 575, venisse eas audiui ex nauta qui illas vexerat; 594, vixdum dimidium dixerat; intellexerat; Hec. 4, ita populus studio stupidus in funambulo animum occuparat; 130, ubiquomque datum erat spatium solitudinis; 181; 802; 862, recte amasti uxorem tuam; nam numquam ante hunc diem eam videram; Ad. 306, neque illum misericordia repressit quoi per vim vitium obtulerat; 435; 618, ut forte erat missa, ilico accedo; 629, non me hanc rem patri, ut ut erat gesta, indicasse! 676, advorsumne illum dicerem quoi veneram advocatus! CIL, i, 541, quod in bello voverat, hanc aedem dedicat. The following examples show the auxiliary *fueram*, instead of *eram*, in the passive form: Amph. 430, eam ego vini, ut matre natum fuerat, eduxi meri; Merc. 232, (capram) posterius quam mercatus fueram, visus sum simiae concredere; Most. 486, condormivimus; lucernam forte oblitus fueram extinguere; Eun. 569, erat quidam eunuchus quem mercatus fuerat.

The name 'rhetorical pluperfect' is sometimes given to those independent pluperfects which are followed by a perfect indicative or historical present; see Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 213, e.g. Curc. 644, ea me spectatum tulerat; postquam illo ventum est, exoritur ventus; Aul. 312, ipsi pridem tonsor unguis dempserat; conlegit, omnia apstulit praesegmina; Bacch. 631, militis parasitus modo venerat; eum reppuli; Merc. 616, iam addicta atque abducta erat, quom ad portum venio; Phor. 101, commorat omnis nos; ibi continuo Antipho (dixit); Hec. 297, vix me abstraxi, vixque hue contuleram; em, nova res ortast; passive with auxiliary *fueram*: Hec. 640, abducta a vobis praegnas fuerat filia neque scivi.

2. The pluperfect refers to an act prior to another past act or point of time *implied in the context*, e.g. Asin. 450, non te provideram, i.e. at the time I noticed you; so And. 183, erus est, neque provideram; Ad. 373, haud aspexeram te; Eun. 1030; Cas. 898, memora, ut oceperas, i.e. before you were interrupted; so Pers. 809, perge ut coeperas; Asin. 125; similarly Epid. 389, qui dudum coeperam me

excruciare; Men. 807, spinter quod ad hanc detulerat, nunc, quia rescivi, refert; Rud. 864, equidem me dixeram praesto fore, i.e. before I set sail; Stich. 516, at apud me perendie; nam ille heri me iam vocaverat; Truc. 393, me habebat, dum hic fuit.: senseram; And. 733, repudio quod consilium primum intenderam; H. T. 1053, video non licere ut coeperam hoc pertendere; Eun. 665, amatores audieram mulierum esse eos maximos; verum non in mentem venerat, i.e. before he came; Phor. 422, nam tua praeterierat ad ducendum aetas; 814; with *fueram* for *eram*: Eun. 280, fortasse tu profectus alio fueras, i.e. at the time I stopped you; Ad. 174, non innueram, i.e. at the time you struck him.

3. The pluperfect refers to a past act not conceived as prior to another past act.¹ This is the most frequent use of the tense in Early Latin, and the one that probably expresses its original force. Examples:

a) *Dixeram*: Amph. 691, qui non abiisti ita ut dixeras; 761; 916, ioco illa dixeram; 918, quin adducis Naucratem, quem te adducturum dixeras? Aul. 287, istuc alioversum dixeram; Bacch. 957, dudum primo ut dixeram nostro seni mendacium, ibi signum ex arce apstuli; Capt. 17, fugitivos ille, ut dixeram ante, vendidit; 194, quo ire dixeram mox ivero; Cas. 599, nempe dixeras tuam arcessituram esse uxorem; Men. 57, ille quem dudum dixeram; 592, aut plus aut minus quam opus erat dicto dixeram; 889, quid esse illi morbi dixeras? 1095, Menaechmum te vocari dixeras; Merc. 467, is se ad portum dixerat ire; 760, nempe uxor rurist tua, quam dudum dixeras te odisse; 975, ille quidem illam se matri emissee dixerat; Pers. 576; Pseud. 406, iam pridem huic daturum dixeram et volui inicere tragulam in nostrum senem; 565, neque sim facturum quod dixeram; Rud. 95; Truc. 133; Phor. 612, audistin quae facta? : omnia. : : tun dixeras huic?

b) *Iusseram*: Amph. 469, neque credet huc profectum ut iusserat; Asin. 714, istunc amoves atque illa quae hic iusserat mihi statuis? Aul. 697, miror ubi sit, quem iusseram hic opperiri; 679, observabo aurum ubi abstrudat, quamquam iusserat; Cas. 147, prandium iusserat senex parari; Cure. 42, nempe obloqui me iusseras; 425; 560, iusseram salvare te; Merc. 698, demiror non

¹ Lübbert, *Syntax von Quom*, p. 168; Brix on Capt. 17; Ussing on Amph. 379.

venire ut iusseram; Pseud. 961, in id angiportum me devorti iusserat. — Not in Terence.

c) *Fueram* : Amph. 458, imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat, possidet; Cure. 637, mihi dedit, ut aequom fuerat; Merc. 972, te haud aequom filio fuerat amicam eripere; M. G. 131, ad meum erum, qui Athenis fuerat; Poen. 64, ei filius unicus qui fuerat; And. 587, non fuerant nuptiae futurae; so 543; Eun. 869, ut eam non possim, ita ut aequom fuerat atque ut studui, tradere; Phor. 400, si falsum fuerat, quor non refellit? 651, ita ut aequom fuerat, volui uxorem ducere; 781, praesens quod fuerat malum, in diem abiit; Hec. 570, hoc mi unum relicuom fuerat malum; 648, etiam si fuerat ambiguum, nunc non est; 812; 867, quos fuerat par resciscere, sciunt; Ad. 686, virginem vitiasti, quam te non ius fuerat tangere.

d) *Dederam* : Men. 426, pallam quam dudum dederas ad phrygionem ut deferas; Pseud. 617, servos eius qui hinc a nobis est mercatus mulierem, qui xv dederat minas, v debet; H. T. 660, vivitne illa quoi tu dederas?

e) *Volueram* ; *nolueram* : Cas. 461, me, quom veneram, facere atriensem voluerat; Bacch. 150, video plus quam volueram; Rud. 707, huc respice! : optume, istuc volueramus; H. T. 866; Hec. 711, ipsa narravit mihi. id hoc praesente tibi nolueram dicere.

f) *Reliqueram* : Capt. 938, postulo ut mihi illum reddas servom quem hic reliqueram; M. G. 1347, animus hanc modo hic reliquerat.

g) *Other verbs* : Amph. 22, scibat quippe qui intellexerat; 383, Amphitruonis te esse aiebas Sosiam. : peccaveram, nam 'Amphitruonem socium' dudum me esse volui dicere; Aul. 33, quo ille eam facilius ducat qui compresserat; 635, illud quod apstuleras cedo; so also 766; 683, obsecro quod dudum obsecraveram; Capt. 156, fugitant hanc provinciam quoi optigerat; Cist. 187, si possiet illam invenire quam olim tollere ex insidiis viderat; 547, vidi exeuntem mulierem — : illam quae meam gnatam sustulerat? M. G. 474, eam osculantem hic videras; Most. 519, an tu appellaveras? 525, cur tanto opere extimueras? 547; 786, quod me miseram adfero; 821, eo pretio empti fuerant olim. : audin 'fuerant' dicere? 822, quanti hosce emeris; Pers. 108, sed ecquid meministi here qua de re mentionem feceram? Pseud. 148, heri edixeram omnibus dederamque eas provincias; 549; 743, meo ludo lamberas; Rud. 554, si me

Plesidippus viderit, quo ab arrabonem acceperam; 850, is nunc cum servis servat. :: ego mandaveram; Stich. 251, iamne cocta sunt? quot agnis fecerat? 651, sed amica mea curaest ut valeat; Sticho mandaveram ut nuntiaret; H. T. 330; Eun. 258, quibus et re salva et perdita profueram et prosum saepe; 856, quid feceras? :: paulum quiddam; Phor. 913, ferme eadem omnia quae dudum incusaveras; Hec. 142, ille invitus illam duxerat; Ad. 26, non rediit Aeschinus neque servolorum quisquam qui advorsum ierant? 347, testis mecum est anulus quem amiserat; with *fuera*m as auxiliary: Phor. 536, si pote fuisset exorari, promissum fuerat.

Barring the examples with *fuera*m,¹ Blase (*Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts*, p. 9 ff.; *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, 1, p. 211 ff.) takes the foregoing examples as referring to an act prior to a point in past time more or less clearly defined in the mind of the speaker. In this he is followed by Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* ii, p. 318 ff. Cf. also Rodenbusch, *op. cit.* p. 30 ff. But the explanations of these scholars seem to me far-fetched and unnatural. To my mind it is much simpler in view of the facts not to attempt to explain the pluperfect of Early Latin as necessarily denoting an act prior to another past act, but to recognize that it is generally used without such connotation. If it be asked wherein the pluperfect, when so employed, differs from the simple perfect, I would suggest that possibly it often denoted an act completed in past time; i.e. it bore the same relation to the imperfect that the present-perfect bore to the present. As an outgrowth of this was the force of the pluperfect referring to the remoter past (cf. Lübbert, *Syntax von Quom*, p. 168). Out of these uses there ultimately grew up the use of the pluperfect referring to an act prior to some other past act definitely alluded to in the immediate context. Evidently this use developed in the period from Plautus to Terence, for the six plays of Terence have more instances of such pluperfects than the twenty plays of Plautus, while instances of the use which I hold to be original are much less abundant in Terence than in Plautus.

4. *Satius fuerat, aequius fuerat, par fuerat*, etc. in the sense of 'would have been preferable,' 'would have been fairer,' etc.:² Cist. 42, satius

¹ This B. regards as arising from a contamination in use of *fui* and *eram*, and to be equivalent to either *eram* or *fui*: *Hist. Gramm.* p. 217 ff.

² Blase, *Hist. Gramm.* iii, 1, p. 222 f.; Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* ii, p. 320.

fuerat eam viro dare nuptum; Cure. 266, namque incubare satius te fuerat Iovi; Stich. 512, magis par fuerat me vobis dare cenam; Trin. 119, ei rei operam dare te fuerat aliquanto aequius, si posses, etc.; 1039, ad parietem sunt fixae, ubi malos mores adfigi nimio fuerat aequius; Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius agere aetatem; 561, aderam, quouis consilio par fuerat ea prospici; And. 691, quibus quidem quam facile potuerat quiesci, si hic quiesset.

Blase, l. c., includes under this head also Cure. 638; Eun. 870; Phor. 651; Hec. 867; Ad. 686. But all of these seem to me different from the examples just cited. I have classified them above (3, c) as illustrations of the pluperfect referring to the simple past. Delbrück, l. c., would interpret all instances of *satius fuerat*, *aequom fuerat*, etc. as normal pluperfects.

5. Different from the instances included under (4) is M. G. 52, *quingentos simul, ni hebes machaera foret, occideras*. Here *occideras* by a rhetorical exaggeration is used for *occidisses*.

6. The pluperfect is also used to denote the state resulting from a completed past act, e.g. Capt. 306, *me qui imperare insueram*; Epid. 223, *quid erat induta?* Pseud. 913 a, *ubi restiteras?* Catulus, Baehrens, p. 276, *constiteram Auroram salutans, quom subito Roscius exoritur*.

THE FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE.¹

The Latin future perfect is by origin an aorist subjunctive. As such its 'Aktionsart' was momentary ('punktuell'). Its time was future. The future perfect indicative, therefore, differed originally from the future only in the kind of action it denoted; it did not differ in the time-sphere. In subordinate clauses, however, the future perfect, like the Greek aorist subjunctive under the same conditions, developed secondarily a genuine future perfect force, i.e. it came to designate a future act which was prior to another future act. This true future perfect function was in Early Latin at times transferred to principal clauses also.

¹ Madvig, *De formarum quarundam verbi latini vi et usu*, Opuscula Academica, 1835, ii, p. 60 ff.; P. Thomas, *La syntaxe du futur passé dans Térence*, *Revue de l'instruction publique Belge*, 1876, p. 365 ff.; 1878, p. 17 ff.; Meifart, *De futuri exacti usu Plautino*, 1885; Fr. Cramer, *Das lat. Futurum Exactum*, *Arch. für lat. Lexikogr.* iv, p. 594 ff.; Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 176 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 321 ff.; Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, 1904, p. 135 ff.

Madvig, l. c., recognized the true future perfect force as original in the tense, but I agree entirely with Meifart, Delbrück, Blase, and Sjögren that this view is inconsistent with the obvious facts of usage in Early Latin, as well as with the origin of the formation itself. We may even go further than this. In the first and second conjugations it is clear that the future in *-bo* is a new formation historically later than the future perfect. In these conjugations, therefore, the future perfect was not only originally a future, but for a time, at least, the only future of which we have any record.

CLASSIFICATION OF FUTURE PERFECT USES.

I. The Future Perfect with the Force of the Future.

1. **1st singular:** Amph. 53, *deus sum, commutavero*; 198, *solens meo more fecero*; so As. 705; Cas. 869; Men. 424; Merc. 497; Poen. 857; Stich. 351; Phor. 882; Amph. 930, *comitem mihi Pudicitiam duxero*; 1000, *illuc susum escendero*; As. 327, *mansero tuo arbitratu*; 439, *sic dederō*; so also Bacch. 49; Most. 1103; Poen. 1286; As. 839, *ne dixis istuc! . . . ilico non dixero*; so also Pers. 185; Pseud. 755; Trin. 465; Phor. 681; Aul. 570, *at ego iussero cadum vini adferrier*; so also Cas. 613; Epid. 657; Stich. 607; Aul. 666, *huc concessero*; Most. 687; Pers. 50; Trin. 1007; Bacch. 211, *immo hercle abiero*; so also Epid. 515; Most. 590; Poen. 442; Pers. 250; Ad. 127; Bacch. 363, *aufugero*; 774, *accessero*; so also Pers. 575; Bacch. 1066, *revenero*; so also M. G. 863; Rud. 779; Capt. 194, *ad fratrem mox ivero*; so also Stich. 484; Capt. 293, *eadem ex hoc quae volo exquaesivero*; so Rud. 330; Capt. 314, *uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curaverit*; 340, *hunc mihi des quem mittam. : immo alium potius misero*; 495, *sic egero*; Cas. 297, *ego pol istam iam aliquovorsum tragulam decidero*; 545, *post convenero*; 781, *ego ruri cenavero*; so Most. 1007; Cas. 787, *eras habuero tamen convivium*; 966, *nunc ego tecum aequom arbitrum captavero*; so Turp. 86; Men. 270, *id utrumque cavero*; so Pseud. 478; Men. 545, *poste reddidero tibi*; 670, *at placuero huic Erotio*; Merc. 413, *quid illa nunc fiet? : ego emero matri tuae ancillam*; 448, *istanc rem ego recte videro*; so also 450; And. 456; Hee. 701; Ad. 538; 845; Merc. 548, *vino et amore delectavero*; M. G. 200, *ego hinc abscessero aps te interim*; Most.

526, ego mihi providero; 921, vel mihi denumerato! ego illi porro denumeravero; 1039, sume! : : eademque opera haec tibi narravero; so also Pseud. 721; Afran. 72; Most. 1143, surge! ego isti adsedero; 1174, ego illum ut sit quietus subegero; Pers. 135, tun illam vendas! : : immo alium adlegavero; 568, venient ad te comissatum. : : at ego intromitti votuero; Poen. 1286, sic dederō; aere militari tetigero lenunculum; 984, si non, tum ad horum mores linguam vortero; Pseud. 333, eadem duo greges virgarum ulnearum adegero; 376, cum illo perdidero fidem; 630, vinctam potius sic servavero; 647, rediero; Rud. 788, recessero; Stich. 93, vos sedete! ego sedero in subsellio; 593, quin tum stans obstrusero aliquid strenue; Trin. 607, si hoc non credis, ego credidero; 655, omnia . . . scio, vel exsignavero; Truc. 547, mox cubitum venero; so also 883; And. 641, molestus certe ei fuero atque animo morem gessero; H. T. 86, aut consolando aut consilio aut re iuvero; 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero; Hec. 599, et illis morem gessero; Atta, 5, aquae ita muginantur hodie. : : atqui ego fontem occlusero. *Faxo* is particularly frequent in this use, e.g. Aul. 578, ego faxo et operam et vinum perdiderit simul; Capt. 801, qui mi opstiterit, faxo vitae is opstiterit suae; Poen. 346, faxo constiterit lymphaticum. For further examples, see p. 225.

2. *2d singular*: Amph. 313, quid si ego illum tangam ut dormiat? : : servaveris; Bacch. 49, eadem biberis; Capt. 296, haec eadem si confiteri vis, tua ex re feceris; so also 1028; Curc. 665; Men. 272; 661; Merc. 139; M. G. 1243; Poen. 1216; 1218; Pseud. 512; Trin. 279; And. 397; Phor. 430; cf. Bacch. 695, effeceris; Capt. 344, at nihil est ignotum mittere; operam luseris; M. G. 297, si falso insimulas, perieris; 572, quod scies, nesciveris; Most. 1151, optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis; Trin. 60, faxo haud tantillum dederis verborum mihi. : : namque enim tu credo me imprudentem obrepseris; Rud. 1151, nugas magnas egeris; Trin. 379, eo pacto addideris nostrae famam familiae; 760, ne tu illud verbum actutum inveneris; And. 640, nil promoveris; H. T. 487, dare deneгарis; Eun. 379, perculeris iam tu me; Hec. 401, et illi miserae indigne factam iniuriam contexeris; Ad. 602, illi ita animum relevabis et tuo officio fueris functus; 819, et mi et tibi et illis dempseris molestiam; 844, eo pacto prorsum illi adligaris filium; Enn. Trag. 165, facile Achivos flexeris.

An examination of the complete context of the foregoing examples of the 2d singular shows that in the large majority of instances the future perfect is the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

3. 3d singular. Here also the usage is largely confined to apodoses of conditional sentences; e.g. *As.* 446, *perii hercle; iam hic me abegerit suo odio*; *Aul.* 656, *hunc si amitto, hic abierit*; *Merc.* 140, *at edepol tu calidam picem bibito; aegritudo abscesserit*; similarly 372; 389; *Most.* 711, *abitus tuos tibi, senex, fecerit male*; so also *Poen.* 886; *Rud.* 180; *Vid.* 36; *Pers.* 269, *verberibus caedi iusserit, compedes impingi*; *Pseud.* 350, *nam hunc fames iam occiderit*; 573 a, *tibicen vos interibi hic delectaverit*; *Trin.* 139, *crede huic tutelam; suam rem melius gesserit*; 856, *conductor de me nugas conciliaverit*; *Truec.* 876, *si auferes, a milite omnis spes animam efflaverit*; *And.* 213, *si lubitum fuerit, causam ceperit*; 381, *invenerit aliquam causam*; 398, *interea aliquid acciderit boni*; *H. T.* 584, *hic prius indicarit quam ego argentum effecero*; 621, *ne ista hercle magno iam conatu magnas nugas dixerit*; *Phor.* 516, *hic tibi quod boni promeritus fueris, conduplicaverit*; also the following examples with *faxo*: *Aul.* 578, *ego faxo et operam et vinum perdiderit simul*; *Capt.* 801, *qui mi opstiterit, faxo vitae is opstiterit suae*; *Poen.* 346, *faxo constiterit lymphaticum*.

4. Plural forms. These do not occur at all in the first and second persons, while of the third person plural but a single example is noted: *Poen.* 617, *interibi attulerint exta*.

As throwing light on the pure future character of the forms above cited, one may instance the frequent occurrence in apparently the same meaning of future and future perfect of the same verb, e.g. *Bacch.* 610, *sed huc concedam*; *Trin.* 1007, *lubet observare quid agat; huc concessero*; *Poen.* 805, *abscedam hinc intro*; *Trin.* 710, *eodem pacto quo huc accessi abscessero*; *Aul.* 176, *conveniam Euclionem, si domi est*; *Cas.* 545, *post convenero*; 547, *ubi nuptiae fuerint, tum istam convenibo*; *Stich.* 351, *convorre! :: ego fecero*; 354, *humum consperge ante aedis! :: faciam*; *Bacch.* 95, *eo tibi argentum iubebo eefferri*; *Cas.* 613, *ego iam per hortum iussero meam transire uxorem*; *Men.* 545, *ego post reddidero tibi . . . :: ego post tibi reddam duplex*. In all of these passages it seems impossible to detect any difference between the force of the future and that of the future perfect.

Cramer (*Archiv für lat. Lexikographie*, iv, p. 595), following G. Hermann, seems to advocate the recognition of a difference of meaning wherever we have different forms of speech. But if there be a difference of force between the tenses in the forms just cited, no one has ever stated it. It is in fact extremely doubtful whether Hermann's dictum is more than a half truth. In view of the not uncommon equivalence of different forms of expression in modern languages, it seems methodically superfluous to insist on a difference in the ancient languages under similar conditions. If the difference exists and is tangible, it should be recognized and stated; but we are under no necessity of attempting to distinguish differences that do not exist.

In addition to the foregoing examples of the parallel use of the future and future perfect of the same verb, it may serve also to cite instances of the use of the future and future perfect of different verbs in the same passage. Thus: *Amph.* 930, *ibo egomet; comitem mihi Pudicitiam duxero; As.* 280, *erum in obsidione linquet, inimicum animos auxerit; Cas.* 780, *vos tamen cenabitis, cena ubi cocta erit; ego ruri cenavero; Men.* 544, *cedo aurum! ego manupretium dabo. :: da sodes aps te; poste reddidero tibi; Poen.* 983, *si respondebunt, Punice pergam loqui; si non, tum ad horum mores linguam vortero; Pseud.* 332, *lanios inde accersam duo, eadem duo greges virgarum ulnearum adegero; Stich.* 351, *cape illas scopas! :: capiam. :: hoc egomet, tu hoc convorre. :: ego fecero; 484, ivero . . . loquar; Eun.* 723, *hac re te omni turba evolves et illi gratum feceris; Phor.* 681, *inde sumam; uxori tibi opus esse dixero; Hec.* 599, *et me hac suspicione exsolvam et illis morem gessero; Acc. Praet.* 15, *patrio exemplo et me dicabo atque animam devoro (= devovero) hostibus.*

The use of the future perfect instead of the future seems in many cases to have been encouraged by metrical convenience. The future perfect was especially adapted to the close of the trimeter or the septenarius, and it is there that it occurs with the greatest frequency.

While by origin aoristic ('punktuell'), the future perfect, to judge from the foregoing examples, seems to have lost in a large number of cases its specific aoristic force and to have become indistinguishable from the simple future.

II. The Future Perfect with Future Perfect Force.

The true future perfect force of the future perfect seems to have originated in subordinate clauses, particularly those introduced by conditional particles. Thus in a sentence like *Bacch. 49, eadem dederō tibi, ubi biberis, saviū*, the connection of thought implies that the idea involved in *biberis* is prior to that in *dederō*.¹ In this way a true future perfect force is evolved, and is the regular value of the tense in subordinate clauses. By a natural transference it appears also in principal clauses, though the pure future meaning is in Early Latin very much commoner. Illustrations of the future perfect meaning are seen in the following:

1. **In principal clauses unaccompanied by a dependent clause.** This type is rare. Examples: *Men. 521, faxo haud inultus prandium comederis*; *Epid. 282, iam igitur amota erit omnis consultatio*; *Phor. 888, nam idem hoc argentum, ita ut datumst, ingratiis ei datum erit*. *Epid. 298, occupatum erit*; *Most. 235, iam ista quidem apsumpta res erit*, cited by Sjögren as true future perfects, do not seem to me clear cases. In both instances *erit* is future and the participle has adjective force. *Men. 295, perieris*, regarded by Sjögren as future perfect, I take (with Brugmann, *Kurze Vergl. Gramm.*, p. 570) as an optative subjunctive.

2. **In principal clauses which are accompanied by a dependent clause:** *Pseud. 629, dum tu sternuas, res soluta erit*; *640, si dare vis mihi, magis erit solutum*; *Trin. 783, ubi thensaurum ecfoderis, suspicionem ab adolescente amoveris*; *Pers. 402, quod si non dederit atque hic dies praeterierit, ego argentum, ille ius iurandum amiserit*; *Men. 54, nam nisi qui argentum dederit, nugas egerit*; *Poen. 81, nisi qui dederit, nugas egerit*; *qui dederit, magis maiores nugas egerit*; *Capt. 695, si istuc faxis, haud sine poena feceris*; *M. G. 573, nec videris quod videris*; *Most. 210, ille te nisi amabit ultro, id pro tuo capite quod dedit perdiderit*; *Rud. 1135, si falsa dicam, frustra dixero*; *Pseud. 512, si abstuleris, mirum et magnum facinus feceris*; *531, si istaec opera perfeceris, virtute regi Agathocli antecesseris*; *H. T. 478, si tuom animum intellexerit, quantam fenestram ad nequitiam patefe-*

¹ Cf. also Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, p. 571, who suggests that pluperfects in *-eram* (denoting a prior past act) may have helped the future perfect to develop the notion of a prior future act.

ceris! Ad. 232, si hoc omitto, refrixerit res. The foregoing are the surest examples of the future perfect used with future perfect force. Possibly some scholars may see even in these passages only a future use.

The So-called 'Shifted' Future Perfect.¹

In his *Historische Syntax der lat. Sprache*, iii, p. 189 ff., Blase recognizes a 'shifted' ('verschobenes') future perfect. His reasoning is as follows: Just as *fui* often means, 'I am no longer,' so *fuert* should have meant 'he will no longer be.' But as a matter of fact numerous instances occur where *fuert* cannot have this meaning, but clearly has the future force of *erit*. Such uses represent the 'shifted' function. Without going into the details of Sjögren's refutation of this view, I will here content myself with referring the reader to his discussion, which seems to me to show conclusively the untenability of Blase's position. The relatively few instances of the use recognized by Blase have already been classified under the use of the future perfect as future. Blase confines the use to *fuert*, and a very limited number of other words, e.g. *habuero* (Cas. 787) and *placuero* (Men. 670).

Future Perfect as Imperative.

In Bacch. 49, eadem biberis, and M. G. 572, quod scies nesciveris, nec videris quod videris; the future perfect has imperative force.

¹See especially Sjögren, p. 173 ff., for a criticism of Blase's view.

CHAPTER III.

THE INDICATIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.¹

PARATAXIS.

Probably the earliest form of the conditional period consisted simply of two paratactic indicatives; cf. Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 580. Yet traces of this are not frequent in Early Latin. The only examples that are at all clear are: Most. 873, *boni sunt, bonust* (Bergk's conj.); *inprobi sunt, malus fit* (*improbis sunt, malus fuit*, codd.; *fit* is Cam.'s conj.); Pseud. 863, *si iste ibit, ito; stabit, astato simul*; Stat. 5, *actutum, voltis, emptast; noltis, non emptast*; Com. Incert. R. p. 142, *tutare amici causam, partis suscipe! Obicitur crimen capitis; purga fortiter* (*p . . .* codd.); Eun. 252, *negat quis, nego; ait, aio*. The other examples cited by Rothheimer, op. cit. p. 12, and Brugmann, op. cit. p. 30, ftn., do not seem to me to belong here.

CLASSIFICATION OF INDICATIVE PROTASES.

I. Protasis In Present Indicative.

Protases in the present indicative fall into two classes, according as the reference is to present or future time.

A. PROTASIS IN PRESENT INDICATIVE REFERRING TO PRESENT TIME OR DENOTING A GENERAL TRUTH.

1. The apodosis is also in the present indicative (293), referring usually to present time, but occasionally to the future.

a) Introduced by *si* (209), e.g. Amph. 1105, *si istaec vera sunt, non metuo*; As. 242, *si adfers, tum patent*; Merc. 185, *ego nugar, si*

¹ Rothheimer, *De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plantinis*, 1876; Liebig, *Die hypothetischen Sätze bei Terenz*, 1863; Lindskog, *de enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium conditionalibus*; O. Brugmann, *Gebrauch des conditionalen NI in der älteren Latinität*, 1887; Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 580 ff.; Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, 1892, p. 43.

respondeo? And. 973, salvos sum, si haec vera sunt; H. T. 105, erras, si credis; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, si inpluit, fieri solet.

b) Introduced by *si modo*. Only Most. 927, sat sapio, si modo caveo; Trin. 1182, bene re gesta salvos redeo, si tu modo frugi esse vis.

c) Introduced by *nisi* (31), e.g. As. 108, eo ad forum nisi quid vis; Men. 1082, nisi animus me fallit, hi sunt gemini; Trin. 439, nequam illud verbum est, nisi qui bene facit; H. T. 614, nisi me animus fallit, hic profectost anulus; Enn. Ann. 330, non est victor, nisi victus fatetur; Amph. 902; Aul. 579; Bacch. 651; 654; Capt. 88; Cas. 731; Poen. 190; 232; And. 950; H. T. 935.

d) Introduced by *nisi si* (6): Amph. 825, nescio quid dicam, nisi si quispiamst alius Amphitruo; Cure. 51, pudica est, nisi si est osculando impudicior; Cato, Agr. 138, asinis feriae nullae, nisi si in familia sunt; Men. 247; Most. 769; Pers. 833.

e) Introduced by *nisi forte*. Only Stich. 356, quid sit nil scio, nisi forte hospites venturi sunt.

f) Introduced by *si non* (21), e.g. Amph. 438, quis sum, si non sum Sosia? Aul. 207, salvom est, si quid non perit; Capt. 81, suo sibi suco vivont, si ros noncadit; And. 237, quid est, si haec non contumeliast? H. T. 666, non licet, si res non sinit; Cist. 297; Cure. 400; Ep. 460; Most. 770; Pers. 578; Trin. 1062; Eun. 35; Ad. 733.

g) Introduced by *ni*: Poen. 286, non potis est fieri, ni sumptus sequitur; Enn. Ann. 371 a, ni metus tenet, quiescunt.

h) Introduced by *si minus*: M. G. 876, minus si tenetis, denuo volo percipiatis; Lucil. 145, si minus delectat, non operam perdo.

i) Introduced by *si nihil*, *si nusquam*: Pers. 585, si tibi subiti nihil est, tantundem est; Pseud. 845, si nusquam is coctum, quidnam cenat?

j) Introduced by *sin* (12), e.g. Men. 579, sin dives malust, frugi habetur; Merc. 589, sin foris sum, animus domist; M. G. 889, sin bene faciundumst, deveniunt obliviosae; H. T. 45, sin lenis est, ad alium defertur gregem; Pers. 454; Stich. 521; Eun. 104; Hec. 255; 780.

k) Introduced by *si . . . sive (seu)* (5): Rud. 629, te oro, si speras seu confidis . . . ut ne pigeat; Truc. 833, si bibit sive adeo caret temeto; And. 216; Cist. 645. *Sive* alone: And. 190.

2. The apodosis stands in the imperfect indicative : As. 452, sed si domist, volebam; Phor. 1023, iam tum erat senex, senectus si verecundos facit; in both of which the expression is obviously elliptical; Enn. Trag. 115, si improbum esse Chrespontem existumas, cur me huic locabas nuptiis?

3. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (70).

a) With *si* (58): particularly in the formulas *si vis, si voltis, si sapis*, as: Amph. 54, si voltis, faciam; As. 453; 654; Aul. 155; 401, tu si sapis, reddes; Cas. 780; 838; Capt. 269, si frugist, admutilabit; 897, aeternum tibi dapinabo victum, si vera autumas; Cas. 998; Cist. 682; And. 737; H. T. 334.

b) With *nisi*: And. 670, alia adgrediemur, nisi putas; II. T. 668, nisi me animus fallit, haud multum a me aberit infortunium.

c) With *si non* (3): Most. 1131, ego ibo, si tibi non lubet; Poen. 371; H. T. 995.

d) With *sin* (4): Epid. 545, sin east quam autumo, congregiar; Trin. 715; 1064; Ad. 492.

e) With *sed si* (3): As. 281, sed si studet, pariet; Hec. 397; Ad. 603.

4. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (16).

a) With *si* (12), e.g. Stich. 398, provenisti futile, si neque adest neque subvenit; Phor. 296, si cognatast maxume, non fuit necesse habere; Naev. Trag. 7. Frequent is the occurrence of *perii, occidi*, or *actum est* in such apodoses; e.g. Epid. 510; Most. 963; And. 465.

b) With *nisi* (3): Pseud. 1213, nisi mirumst, perdidisti; so Stat. 255; Trin. 458, nisi aliud vis, respondi.

c) With *sin*: Hec. 559, sin est ut nolit, recte consului.

5. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative: Capt. 309, hoc te monitum, nisi forte non vis, volueram.

6. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (4): M. G. 298, si verum est, periveris; Poen. 442, si nequeo facere, abiero; Trin. 607, si hoc non credis, ego credidero; Poen. 80; Pseud. 640.

7. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive, hortatory, optative, etc. (34).

a) Hortatory (2): Merc. 578, si censes, arripiamus; Ad. 601.

b) Jussive (19). With *si* (15), e.g. Capt. 63, si quis exspectat, litis contrahat; M. G. 1037, adeat, si quid volt; Eun. 5; Phor. 12;

Ad. 514 si is est, faciat; Afran. 355.—With *si non*, Poen. 24, si id facere non queunt, domum abeant!—With *sin* (4): Phor. 925, sin est ut velit, dos hic maneat! Hec. 502; 637; Ad. 515.

c) Permissive (3): As. 460, ne duit, si non volt; Bacch. 90, tu nullus adfueris, si non lubet; Epid. 584.

d) Optative (6): Pseud. 272, si dignu's, neque ament neque faciant! Rud. 569, Iupiter te perdat, et si sunt et si non sunt; Trin. 992; Hec. 102, ita di faxint, si in rem est Bacchidis; Bacch. 505, mihi numquam creduat, ni illam—amo; Ad. 700, di me oderint, ni te amo.

e) Potential (5): Aul. 747, si istuc ius est, deripiamus; Phor. 656, si volt, nullam malim dari; Rud. 744, tanta esset, si vivit; Bacch. 914, si non est, nolis esse.

8. The apodosis is an imperative, usually present, but sometimes future (123).

a) With *si* (99): e.g. XII Tab. 1, si in ius vocat, ito; ibid. si calvitur pedemve struit, manum endo iacito! ibid. 4; 5; As. 354, si erum vis, adduce; Bacch. 870, illoc pacisce, si potest; Rud. 1177, hunc si potes, fer intro; And. 546, si in remst, iube! As. 645; 701; Aul. 161; Bacch. 998; 1025; Capt. 219; 603; 893; 978; H. T. 1031; 1051; Eun. 106; Phor. 197; 387; 527.

b) With *si modo*: only Truc. 890, sine, si is est modo.

c) With *nisi* (13): e.g. Bacch. 1118, iube aperiri fores, nisi mavoltis comminui; Men. 992, facite illic homo ablatu siet, nisi vos nihili penditis; 1066; M. G. 182; H. T. 880, desine, nisi iudicas; Eun. 796, Pamphilam redde, nisi mavis; Ad. 806.

d) With *si non* (5): Men. 534, redde, si non meministi; And. 327, si id non potest, saltem aliquot dies profer! 692; Eun. 503; Phor. 994.

e) With *si minus*: only Truc. 900, si minus (*mihi*, codd.) credis, respice.

f) With *ni, nive*: Cas. 75, id ni fit, mecum pignus dato; Epid. 700, ni matris filiast, in meum nummum pignus da! Pers. 186, da pignus, ni omnia memini et scio et si scis; Rud. 712, habe iudicem, si tuas esse oportet nive eas esse oportet liberas neu te in carcerem compingi aequom est. For a discussion of the origin of the use of *ni, nive* in sentences of this kind, see Bennett, Transactions of Amer. Philol. Assoc., xxxi, p. 242 ff.

9. Type *quid si* (10), e.g. Cist. 273, *quid si amo?* Merc. 890, *quid si mi animus fluctuat?* Rud. 1086; Phor. 661, *quid si animam debet?* — *Quid si non?* Pers. 613, *quid si non volt?* Asin. 195; Poen. 722.

10. Verb of protasis understood from the context (4): Amph. 446, *si tergum cicatricosum, nil hoc similist similius;* M. G. 631; Stich. 521; Phor. 211.

11. *Mirum ni* (7) *mira sunt ni* (2) *mirum si* (2): Cas. 554, *mirum ni subolet;* Amph. 319; And. 598; H. T. 663; Eun. 344; Pseud. 1216, *mira sunt, ni Pseudolust;* so Trin. 861; Truc. 305, *nil mirum lateres si ruont;* And. 755, *mirum si facit.*

12. The apparent apodosis is not the logical apodosis, which is understood (14), e.g. Amph. 427, *si tu Sosia's, quid fecisti?* i.e. 'If you are S., then tell me what you did!' Similarly Amph. 1024, *sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas;* Epid. 448, *quem quaeris, ego sum, si quid vis;* Merc. 767; Most. 1075; Poen. 1047; Phor. 1023, *iam tum erat senex, senectus si verecundos facit;* Men. 566.

13. There is no formal apodosis, but one is suggested by the context (28).

a) With *si* (19), e.g. Cure. 672, *quid cessas dare?:: si haec volt;* Most. 986, *amburet ei misero coreulum carbunculus:: si quidem istaec vera sunt;* Poen. 311, *suspende te!:: si quidem tu es mecum futurus;* Pseud. 877; Eun. 76, *itane suades?:: si sapis;* 410.

b) With *nisi* (5): Cure. 82, *eine sinus fertur?:: nisi nevis;* Men. 787; M. G. 185; Most. 807; Trin. 1156.

c) With *nisi si*: And. 249, *quam ob rem (repetor), nisi si id est quod suspicor?* Eun. 160.

d) With *sin* (2): Pseud. 253, *non lubet:: sin tuamst in rem;* Trin. 47.

14. The apodosis consists not of a verb, but of some other part of speech (9).

a) With *si* (7): e.g. Asin. 384, *ohe, si quid audis;* M. G. 649, *O lepidum senem, si habet;* Poen. 207, *em amores tuos, si vis spectare;* Ad. 992, *sed si voltis, ecce me qui id faciam.*

b) With *sin*: Merc. 143, *sin saluti quod tibi esse censeo, id consuadeo;* Pers. 227, *sin te amo?* In these last two the apodosis consists of the adversative element contained in *sin*.

15. Aposiopesis (5).

a) With *si* (3): And. 790, *si* pol Glycerio non omnia haec —; Ad. 137, *si* obsto . . . em desino; 969.

b) With *sin*: Epid. 543, *sin* est homo; Cas. 981.

16. The phrase *si dis placet* (4). This is not properly a protasis, but has become purely formulaic. Capt. 454, *expedivi, si dis placet*; Truc. 647; Eun. 919; Ad. 476.

B. PROTASES IN PRESENT INDICATIVE REFERRING TO FUTURE TIME.

1. The apodosis also stands in the present indicative, and, like the protasis, usually refers to future time (68).

a) With *si* (34), e.g. Asin. 320, *si* obtines, *salvi sumus*; Capt. 446, *satin habes, si refero?* Cas. 338, *melius res tibi habet tua, si impetramus*; 955; Cure. 328, *invenire possum, si mi operam datis*; 374; Men. 126, *si foris cenat, me ulciscitur*; Stich. 535, *si conficio, transeo*; And. 244, *si fit, pereo*; H. T. 930, *si pergo, ad rastros res redit*; Phor. 604; 856.

b) With *nisi* (26), e.g. Cas. 715, *eo nunciam, nisi remorare*; Epid. 83, *nisi suffulcis firmiter, non potes supsistere*; Men. 150, *non pergo, nisi scio*; Most. 539, *manifesta res est, nisi quid occorro*; Pseud. 70, *vastities venit, nisi in test salus*; 381; H. T. 669, *in angustum meae coguntur copiae, nisi aliquid video*; Phor. 179; Ad. 231.

c) With *nisi si*: Capt. 529, *nec copia est, nisi si aliquam machinor astutiam*.

d) With *si non* (3): Cure. 69, *si non adfert, quo me vortam nescio*; 373; Pseud. 375.

e) With *ni*: Capt. 103, *ni recipit, nihil est quo me vortam*; Pseud. 600 a.

f) With *quod si*: Phor. 201, *quod si eo meae fortunae redeunt, nullast mihi vita expetenda*.

g) With *sin*: And. 210, *sin opitutor, huius minas (timeo)*.

2. The apodosis stands in the future (121).

a) With *si* (61), e.g. Amph. 1005, *deludetur, si quidem vos voltis operam dare*; Asin. 193, *si dantur, dabo*; Aul. 489, *quo nubent, si istud ius ponitur*; 573, *te reddam, si vivo*; Bacch. 570, *si pergis, tollam ted*; 766, *vorsabo illunc, si vivo*; Capt. 331, *si reddis, te amittam*; 409, *si rebito, faciam*; 587; Rud. 1125, *si tacet, tacebo*;

And. 866, si vivo, tibi ostendam; H. T. 696, si abis et Bacchidem relinquis, senex resciscet; Phor. 628; Hec. 112; Ad. 880.

b) With *si modo*, *modo si*: Amph. 646, id modo si datur mihi, satis esse ducam; Rud. 951, dicam, si fidem modo das.

c) With *nisi* (42), e.g. Amph. 357, faciam te superbum, nisi abis; Asin. 532, nisi adfert xx minas, trudetur; Aul. 644, id fiet, nisi fatere; 759; Bacch. 1147, nisi producuntur, truces erimus; Capt. 593, insectabit, nisi iubes; Cas. 643; 729; Cist. 463; Cure. 575; 718; Rud. 431, nisi oras, non feres; 999; 1004; 1289; And. 776, nisi tollis, hunc provolvam; H. T. 33, plura dicet, nisi finem facit; 730; 932; 1003; Eun. 803; Ad. 173.

d) With *si non* (6): Amph. 929, si non iubes, ibo egomet; M. G. 268, si non reperio, ibo; 920; Stich. 646; And. 208, si non providentur, me pessum dabunt; Lucil. 559.

e) With *ni* (10), e.g. Amph. 440, vapulabis, ni abis; Asin. 474, crura diffingentur, ni percies; 670; 706; Bacch. 858, ni exsolvor, hominem opprimit; Cure. 723; Rud. 1009; Truc. 286.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (25). The most frequent form of the apodosis is *perii*, *interii*, *occidi*, or some similar locution.

a) With *si* (7), e.g. Asin. 360, si adfert, nos exclusi sumus; Merc. 530, animus rediit, si mecum servatur fides; 593; M. G. 306, si indicium facio, interii; Poen. 915; Ad. 458, si deseris tu, periimus.

b) With *nisi* (15), e.g. Asin. 287, perii, nisi Libanum invenio; Capt. 539, occisa est res, nisi reperio; 749; Cist. 671; Epid. 82, nisi quid auxili est, apsumptus es; M. G. 295; 828; Rud. 683, nisi quid apparas, acta haec res est; 1415; Vid. 66; And. 642.

c) With *si non*: Asin. 243, interii, si non invenio.

d) With *ni*: Asin. 918, ni impetro, regem perdidi; Stich. 401, ni expello, occidi. •

4. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (5).

a) With *si* (4): Aul. 656, hunc si amitto, hic abierit; Capt. 296, si confiteri vis, ex tua re feceris; M. G. 297; Ad. 127, si pergis, abiero.

b) With *si non*: H. T. 107, si id non facis, invenero.

5. The apodosis stands in the imperative (25).

a) With *si* (15), e.g. Asin. 383, si est intus, evocato; Men. 1093, liber esto, si invenis; M. G. 255; Pers. 659, age, si quid agis (so frequently); Poen. 1237; Cato, Agr. 157, 10, si dolent, lavito.

b) With *nisi*: Cure. 535, nisi properas dare, vitam propera ponere; Phor. 988, nisi sequitur, pugnosc in ventrem ingere.

c) With *si non* (3): Men. 199, si non saltas, exue; M. G. 1394, si non sequitur, rapite sublimem; Cato, Agr. 2, 2.

d) With *ni* (5): XII Tab. 1, ni it, antestamino; ibid. ni pacunt, caussam coiciunto; 3, ni iudicatum facit, secum ducito; ibid. ni suo vivit, dato; 8, ni testimonium fariatur, improbus esto.

6. The apodosis is a jussive subjunctive. Only Cato, Agr. 2, 1, eodem die si potest, circumeat!

7. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive (4): And. 528, si impetro, quid malim? Ad. 531; Cato, fr. Jord. 27, 5, si volo augurium optime tenere, ecquis me ob eam rem augurem capiat? Pers. 370, at si non licet, quid agam?

8. Type *quid si* (7): Amph. 849, quid si adduco tuum cognatum? Bacch. 1184; Cas. 269; 270; Men. 844, quid si servos cito? H. T. 719, quid si redeo? Phor. 210.

9. The apodosis is either a verb to be understood from the context, or is contained in some other part of speech (8): Pseud. 519, mortalem graphicum, si servat fidem; Truc. 923, malo tuo, nisi ego aliqui gaudeo; Amph. 793, cum cruciatus, nisi apparet, tuo; Asin. 471; H. T. 331, quid aliud vis? :: siquidem hoc fit; Phor. 805, numquamne concedes mihi? :: si tu nil narras? 492, sin fidem do? Cato, Agr. 136.

10. Aposiopesis (4): And. 516, nisi fit . . . ; Eun. 990, si vivo . . . ; Ad. 135; Phor. 937.

II. Protasis in the Imperfect Indicative.

a) With *si* (9): Asin. 143, ea si erant, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias; M. G. 1326, nil miror, si lubenter hic eras; Poen. 526, si properabas, magis, pridie nos huc duxisse oportuit; Pseud. 286, si amabas, invenires; 798, si arbitrabare, cur conducebas? 800, cur sedebas, si eras coquos? Truc. 748, si volebas, auferres dimidium domum; Turp. 21, si flabat Aquilo, inopia tum erat piscati; Cato, fr. Jord. 83, 3, si quis in ea re studebat, aut sese ad convivia applicabat, grassator vocabatur.

b) With *nisi*: Stich. 130, nisi placebant, non datas oportuit.

c) With *si minus*: Phor. 361, nihil est quod suscenseam, si illum minus norat.

III. Protasis in the Future Indicative.

1. The apodosis stands in the present indicative (34), which usually refers to the future.

a) With *si* (30), e.g. Bacch. 911, *satin est, si plura audiet?* Capt. 209, *si erit occasio, haud dehortor*; 625, *si secus reperies, nullam causam dico*; Epid. 37, *modo videndum est, si dabit*; Merc. 526; M. G. 249, *sed si volet, quid agimus?* 694; Eun. 382, *an id flagitiumst, si deducar et fallam?* Ad. 347, *si infitias ibit, testis mecum est anulus*; Cato, Agr. 3, 4, *fieri potest, si facies*; 14, 1; 43, 1, *si erit, oportet*; 157, 7, *purgat, si edes*.

b) With *nisi*: Men. 694, *nisi feres argentum, me ductare non potes*; Trin. 919.

c) With *si non*: Trin. 793, *si non feret, dici non potest*.

d) With *ni*: Rud. 578, *an te paenitet, ni eluam?*

2. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (115).

a) With *si* (100), e.g. Asin. 109, *si quid te volam, ubi eris?* 237; 597, *si voles, manebo*; Bacch. 1001, *non dabis, si sapies*; Capt. 196, *si id facietis, levior labos erit*; 497; Epid. 647, *si quid erit dubium, inmutabo*; Merc. 207; M. G. 195, *istaec, si erit hic, nuntiabo*; 1239; 1365; Rud. 417; 788; 1401; Trin. 300, *si mea imperia capesses, multa bona consident*; And. 920, *si perget, audiet*; H. T. 217; 748; 872, *domi ero, si quid me voles*; Phor. 359; Ad. 565, *continebit, si sapiet, manus*; Cato, Agr. 1, 7, *si me rogabis, sic dicam*; 4, *si videbit, facilius vendes*; 5, 2; 157, 6; 158, 2, *si voles, licebit*; Liv. And. Trag. 1, *si imitabo, tum tu pretium pro noxa dabis*.

b) With *nisi* (11), e.g. Capt. 179, *nisi qui meliorem (condicionem) adferet, me addicam*; Cas. 123, *nisi erunt semper plena, te implebo*; Men. 662, *numquam introibis, nisi feres*; M. G. 450; Pers. 430; Poen. 14; Trin. 612; Ad. 454, *nisi facient, haud sic auferent*.

c) With *si non* (3): M. G. 1240, *si non quibo, consciscam letum*; Pseud. 555; And. 700.

d) With *si neminem*: Pseud. 120, *si neminem alium potero, tantam patrem*.

e) With *ni*: Rud. 753, *ni offerumentas habebis pluris, tum ero mendacissimus*.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative: Eun. 51, si incipies, actumst; 717, actumst, siquidem me ludificabere.

4. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (13).

a) With *si* (10), e.g. Capt. 695, hau sine poena feceris, si rebitet; 968; M. G. 1243, te vilem feceris, si te ultro largiere; Pseud. 949; Trin. 279; And. 397, sed si te aequo animo ferre accipiet, neclegentem feceris; Ad. 817.

b) With *nisi*: Most. 210, nisi amabit, quod dedit perdiderit; Stich. 62.

5. The apodosis stands in the imperative (116). This form of conditional sentence is especially common in Cato's *De Agr.*, in which two thirds of all the examples occur.

a) With *si* (96), e.g. XII Tab. 3, si volet, suo vivito; *ibid.* 1, si nolet, arceram ne sternito; 3, si volet, plus dato; Leg. Reg. ii, 2, si tanget, (*tangit*, Gell. iv, 3, 3), agnum caedito; Asin. 165, ductato, si dabis; Aul. 94, dicito, si quis petet; 340; Capt. 114, sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent; Cas. 146; Epid. 264, si placebit, utitor; 658; Stich. 148, si veniet nuntius, facito ut sciam; And. 863, si invenies, occidito; H. T. 865, si voles, dicito; 972; Eun. 596; 768; Hec. 76, si quaeret, dicito; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, stramenta si deerunt, frondem legito; 9, si habebis, facito; 18, 1, si voles, componito; 18, 9; 22, 1; 24; 54, 4; 64, 2; 99; 108; 112; 132, 2; 156, 1; 157, 16; Pacuv. 341, me occide, si prohibam.

b) With *si non* (16), e.g. Epid. 264, si non placebit, reperitote rectius; Eun. 503, si id non poterit, ad me adducito; Cato, Agr. 9, si non habebis, facito; 18, 5, duplices indito, si solidas non habebis; 43, 1, si lapis non erit, consternito; 54, 2; 93; 146, 3, si non reddet, aequom solvito; 151, 4, si quando non pluet, inrigato; 157, 9; CIL i, 199, 25, sei Langenses eam pecuniam non dabunt, tum debento.

c) With *si minus*: Cato, Agr. 141, 4, si minus in omnes litabit, sic verba concipito.

d) With *sin*: Rud. 815, sin ipse abitere hinc volet, amplexitote; Enn. Trag. 301, sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito.

e) With *sive*: Cato, Agr. 52, 2, sive calix erit, conquassato.

6. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (12):

a) With *si* (11), e.g. M. G. 936, hoc si efficiam, quid tibi mittam?

Poen. 1409, si reddes, compingere; Pers. 786, ut non cogam, si vivam? Eun. 441, si quando illa dicet, Pamphilam cantatum provocemus; Hec. 78, si quaeret, uti dicas; Cato, Agr. 1, 3, si poteris, sub radice montis siet; 144, 4, si volent, iurent; 146, 3; 156, 6; Lucil. 809, pistricem validam, si nummi suppeditabunt, addas.

b) With *si non*: Hec. 79, si non quaeret, nullus dixeris.

7. **Type *quid si* (6)**: Amph. 392, quid si falles? Merc. 908, quid si optabo? Most. 582; H. T. 676; Phor. 320; Hec. 442.

8. **The verb of the protasis is understood (6)**:

a) With *si* (3): And. 713, at tamen, si quid; ibid. veniam, si quid; Eun. 889, tamen si pater quid?

b) With *si non*: Poen. 984, si non, tum vortero (*si respondebunt* has preceded); Cato, Agr. 157, 9, si non, dato panem purum (*si poterit* has preceded).

c) With *si secus*: Cas. 377, sin secus, patiemur aequis animis (*si illuc quod volumus eveniet* has preceded).

9. **The apodosis is either a verb to be supplied from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech (8)**.

a) With *si* (7): Eun. 443, si laudabit illius formam, tu huius contra (sc. lauda); Ad. 539, si quid rogabit, nusquam tu me; Cato, Agr. 22, 4, si orbes parabis, medios crassos pedem unum; 43; 61, 2; 136.

b) With *si non*: Cato, Agr. 126, ad tormina, et si alvos non consistet, et si lumbrici erunt.

c) With *si modo*: Trin. 1187, dicis; si facies modo.

10. ***Mirum ni***: Eun. 230, mirum ni me turpiter hic dabo.

11. **Aposiopesis (4)**: Phor. 51, si quis me quaeret; 319; Hec. 765; M. G. 527, si non videbit.

IV. Protasis in the Perfect Indicative.

1. **The apodosis stands in the present indicative (73)**. The perfect indicative of the protasis is regularly a present perfect.

a) With *si* (57), e.g. Amph. 853, si deliqui, nulla causa est; Asin. 224, si papillam contrectavit, haud est ab re; Bacch. 192, si illa inventast, vivit; 528; Capt. 117, si datast occasio, satis est; 195; Merc. 774, si quid evenit, non est mea culpa; 821; Pseud. 905, si umquam di voluere, tum me servatum volunt; Rud. 192; And.

504, si occepi, censes; 572; Phor. 273, si quis fecit, nostran culpa est? Hec. 552; Ad. 976, si dedit, haud dubiumst quin aequom siet; Cato, fr. Jord. 42, 6; Turp. 175, miserum puto, si etiam istuc accessit.

b) With *nisi* (5): Amph. 765, demiror qui sciat, nisi convenisti; M. G. 272, nisi ambulavi dormiens, certo scio; 638; Most. 953; Pers. 838.

c) With *nisi si* (4): Truc. 669, mirum videtur non rediisse, nisi si conlapsus est; H. T. 391, nisi si prospectum aliquid est, desertae vivimus; Eun. 661; Ad. 594, officium facio, nisi si me in illo credidisti esse numero. This last and possibly the first belong only formally under this head, the logical apodosis being understood.

d) With *ni*: Pers. 839, nec sat honestus, ni id ecfecit; Rud. 1070.

e) With *si non*: Asin. 907, si non didicisti, non mirandumst; Bacch. 193, si non inventast, minus valet; Cas. 306.

f) With *si minus*: M. G. 602, surripitur, si minus cum cura locus lectus est.

g) With *si neque* (= *si non*): Cato, Agr. 141, 4, si quid tibi neque satisfactum est, te piaculo.

h) With *sed si* = *sin*: Rud. 193, sed si curavi, tum hoc indecore datis. *Si me impiavi* has preceded.

2. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (6).

a) With *si* (4): Epid. 362, uno modo persuadebit, si illam adempsit Orcus; Eun. 924, quod si astu rem tractavit, quantam laudem capiet Parmeno? Cato, Agr. 157, 4.

b) With *nisi*: Pseud. 178, nisi penus convenit, prostituam vos.

c) With *si parum*: Rud. 1103, si parum intellexti, denuo dicam.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (17).

a) With *si* (16), e.g. Amph. 817, quid deliqui, si tecum fui? Asin. 272; 942; Cas. 997, si feci, feci nequiter; Epid. 91; 630; Pseud. 910, interii, si ille abiit; Truc. 43; H. T. 631, si peccavi, insciens feci; Eun. 27; Hec. 709, non mirum fecit, si hoc aegre tulit.

b) With *sin*: Merc. 594, sin fecit, non abiit salus.

4. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (10).

a) With *si* (8), e.g. Cas. 246, di me infelicit, si in os meum vini guttam indidi; Asin. 537, si animus occupatust, quid faciam? Ad. 690, si te puduit, qua resciscerem? Asin. 770, si quem aspexit, caeca siet; Aul. 645, di me perdant, si quicquam abstuli; M. G. 833.

b) With *si non*: Amph. 572, merito maledicas mi, si non id ita factumst.

c) With *si nemo*: Cist. 683, si nemo praeteriit, hic iaceret.

5. The apodosis stands in the imperative (16).

a) With *si* (13), e.g. XII Tab. 3, si plus minusve secuerunt, se fraude esto; ibid. 8; 12; Aul. 396, confige fures, si (*cui* codd.) subvenisti antidhac; Cas. 3, si verum dixi, signum date; Poen. 1320; Hec. 253, siquid est peccatum, profer; Ad. 184; Cato, Agr. 157, 4, luxatum si quid est, foveto; Naev. Com. 13, si unquam quicquam feci, carnificem cedo.

b) With *nisi*: Ad. 483, extorque, nisi ita factumst; Cato, Agr. 144, 2.

c) With *si numquam*: H. T. 48, si numquam statui et in animum induxi, exemplum statuite in me.

6. Type *mirum est ni (nisi)* (7): Capt. 824, mirum est ni fecere; 805, mira sunt ni sumpsit; so Bacch. 450; Amph. 432; Amph. 283, mira sunt nisi invitavit; Poen. 839, mira sunt nisi erus hunc heredem fecit; Stat. 101, mirum nisi frater turbam aliquam dedit.

7. Type *quid si* (5): Epid. 599, quid si servo aliter visum est? Pseud. 539; Eun. 875, quid si hoc quispiam voluit deus? Amph. 701; Pseud. 286, quid si non habui?

8. Various idiomatic forms.

a) Expressions of which Amph. 457, an egomet me reliqui, si forte oblitus fui, is the type. Similarly Most. 941, nihil ad me attinet? : : nisi forte factu's praefectus novos; Epid. 22, ubi is ergost? nisi si in vidulo attulisti; Poen. 514, nisi cum pedicis condidicistis grassari; Cas. 637, timeo quid sit, nisi se percussit flore Liberi.

b) The apodosis is either understood from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech: Cas. 305, si id factum est, ecce me nullum senem; Rud. 776, maxumo malo suo, si attigerit sive oceptassit.

c) The perfect indicative of the protasis is equivalent to a future perfect: Most. 827, satis boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice.

V. Protasis in the Pluperfect Indicative.

The pluperfect indicative in the protasis of conditional sentences is extremely rare. The only examples I have noted are: Aul. 427, *quid tibi erat negoti, nisi iusseram?* Bacch. 423, *nisi in palaestram veneras, poenas penderes*; Phor. 400, *id si falsum fuerat, quor non fefellit?* Hec. 181, *si quando ad eam accesserat, fugere*; Cato, Frag. Jord. 35, 3, *si quis strenue fecerat, donabam*. In the last two examples *si* has a pronounced temporal force.

VI. Protasis in the Future Perfect Indicative.

1. The apodosis stands in the present indicative (39), which often has future force.

a) With *si* (23), e.g. Asin. 154, *non potest auferre, si quis venerit*; Bacch. 364, *si ero reprehensus, macto illum infortunio*; Cist. 147, *si usus venerit, meminisse vos volo*; Cure. 85; 555; H. T. 437, *pessume consulis, si ostenderis*; Phor. 347, *si sustinueris, ludas licet*; 579; Cato, Agr. 157, 10, *si quando usus venerit, potest*.

b) With *nisi* (9), e.g. Asin. 94, *quoi nil est, nisi defrudaveris*; Poen. 1208, *nisi faxint, qui sperem haud scio*; Pseud. 100, *nisi dacrumis fleveris argenteis, non refert*; 781; And. 565, *qui scis, nisi periculum feceris?*

c) With *ni*: Men. 471, *non is sum qui sum, ni hanc iniuriam ultus fuero*.

d) With *nisi si*: Eun. 901, *non credo, nisi si commissum non erit*; Pacuv. 7, *non intellegimus, nisi si aperte dixeris*.

e) With *si non*: Aul. 250, *si non dederō, impero*; Pseud. 533, *si non faxis, numquid causaest?*

f) With *si . . . seu; sive . . . sive*: Merc. 311, *si movero me seu secari sensero, auctor sum ut me enices*; Cato, Agr. 139, *sive ego sive quis meo iussu fecerit, precor*.

2. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (159).

a) With *si* (133), e.g. Asin. 370, *illum oblectabo, si advenerit*; 837, *credam, si videro*; Capt. 124, *si faxis, te in caveam dabo*; 809; M. G. 701, *si amiseris libertatem, haud facile restitues*; 859; Rud. 1083, *suppetias feret, si dederit*; And. 773, *si viderit, non dabit*; H. T. 698, *si abduxeris, celabitur*; Eun. 299; Phor. 637, *si dixeris,*

tria non commutabitis verba; Cato, Agr. 5, 5, si fecerit, scibit; 94; 148, 2; Enn. Trag. 224, si offendero, moriere; Porc. Licin. Baehr. p. 279, si attigero, incendam omnem silvam; Lucil. 660.

b) With *quod si*: H. T. 724, quod si me deceperit, frustra veniet.

c) With *nisi* (11), e.g. Asin. 487, numquam feres, nisi iusserit; 817; Capt. 724, nisi confeceris, nomen indetur tibi; Epid. 728, numquam, nisi orassis, solves; Men. 256, nisi revorteris, gemes; Pers. 218; Phor. 220, ego plectar, nisi quid me fefellerit; Naev. Com. 8, eos vendam, nisi tu viceris.

d) With *si non* (10): Pseud. 212, si mihi non oleum deportatum erit, te faciam; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, si non caveris, fructum amittes; 144, 3; 144, 5; 147; 148 (ter); Plaut. fr. 74, peribo, si non fecero; Eun. 888.

e) With *ni* (4): M. G. 156, ni diffregeritis talos, vostra faciam latera lorea; Rud. 731; Truc. 624.

f) With *sin*: Phor. 584, sin spreverit, sciet.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (10), which often has future force; *perii* and similar expressions are common in the apodosis.

a) With *si* (7), e.g. Amph. 320, perii, si me aspexerit; 428, victus sum, si dixeris; Men. 416, periisti, si intrassis; Merc. 909; And. 213; Eun. 1064; Phor. 248.

b) With *si nulla*: And. 960, mi immortalitas partast, si nulla aegritudo huic gaudio intercesserit.

c) With *ni*: M. G. 163, disperiistis, ni mulcassitis; Most. 212, perii, ni enicasso.

4. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (18).

a) With *si* (14), e.g. Amph. 198, si dixero mendacium, more meo fecero; Bacch. 363, aufugero, si usus venerit; Capt. 695; Men. 112; Pseud. 376, si attuleris, fidem perdidero; Rud. 1150, si tantillum peccassis, nugas egeris; Trin. 855; And. 213, si lubitum fuerit, causam ceperit; H. T. 478, si intellexerit, quantam fenestram patefeceris! Cato, Agr. 4, si aedificaveris, bene posiveris.

b) With *nisi* (3): Men. 54, nisi dederit, nugas egerit; Most. 1006; Poen. 81.

c) With *si non*: Pers. 402, si non dederit, ius iurandum amiserit.

5. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (23).

a) With *si* (12): Amph. 672, si situlam cepero, numquam creduis; Asin. 782, si religiosa fuerit, tibi dicat; 854; Cist. 497, di me perdant si duxero; 499; Rud. 789, si te offendero, numquam quisquam me lenonem dixerit; 1383, haud ausim (*aut sim*, codd.), si condemnavero; Cato, Agr. 5, 1, si quis deliquerit, vindicet; 5, 2; si passus erit, ne sinat; 144, 4, si quis fecerit, iurent; 149, 2; Turp. 26, si iceris me posthac, credas mihi velim.

b) With *nisi*: Cist. 522, di faxint, nisi te optruncavero; Most. 193, di me interficiant, nisi illam interfecero.

c) With *ni* (6): Asin. 764, ni abalienarit, tuos arbitratus sit; Bacch. 847; Most. 222; Stich. 191, lumbos diffractos velim, ni vere perierit; Truc. 307.

d) With *si non* (3): Pers. 164, sibi habeat, si non abduxero; Phor. 514, si non dedero, ne oppertus sies; Cato, Agr. 146, 3, si non solverit, solvat.

6. The apodosis stands in the imperative (43).

a) With *si* (35), e.g. XII Tab. 8, si iniuriam faxsit, xxv poenae sunt; ibid. si fraudem fecerit, sacer esto; Leg. Reg. ii, 3 (Fest. p. 178, M), si hominem fulmen Iovis occisit, ne tollito; Asin. 228, remeato, si nactus eris; 231; 371; 800; Men. 156, oculum ecfodito mihi, si ullum verbum faxo; Pseud. 510; And. 752, verbum si faxis, cave; H. T. 550; Eun. 853, si aliam admisero, occidito; Cato, Agr. 44, si quid ventus interfregerit, eximito; 65, 1; 146, 2.

b) With *nisi* (3): Capt. 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; Pseud. 950; Stich. 436.

c) With *ni* (3): XII Tab. 7, ni delapidassint, qua volet iumento agito; M. G. 927, ni ludificata ero, culpam in me imponito; Pseud. 520, servitum me abducito, ni fecero.

d) With *si non*: Poen. 1280, si non ultus fuero, me habento ludificatui; Bacch. 555, si non fecero, me esse dicito ignavissimum.

7. Type *quid si* (7): Asin. 105, quid si in insidias devenero? 720; Cas. 345, quid si sors aliter evenierit? Pseud. 514; Rud. 721; H. T. 718, quid tum si pater resciverit? M. G. 1417, quid si id non faxis?

8. Various idiomatic forms:

a) The apodosis is either a verb to be supplied from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech: Pers. 579, si quidem hanc vendidero; Poen. 1360, perii. : immo hau multo post, si

veneris; Pseud. 513, si non apstuleris? Rud. 775, maxumo malo suo, si attigerit sive ocepisset; Trin. 483, non hercle longe, nisi me vicerit; Phor. 440, si quid opus fuerit, heus domo me! Cato, Agr. 110, si demptus erit odor, id optime.

b) The verb of the protasis is omitted: Cato, 110, si non, saepius facito. *Si demptus erit* has preceded.

c) Aposiopesis: Pers. 787, si redierit . . .; Poen. 428; And. 164, quem quidem si sensero; 860; Eun. 1019.

VII. Protases exhibiting a Combination of Two Tenses in Coördination.

The examples I have noted are: Capt. 1034, si placet et si placuimus, signum hoc mittite; Pseud. 143, nisi animum advortetis, nisi somnum exmovetis, faciam; Truc. 40, itidem est, amator si dedit atque est benignus; And. 41, si quid feci aut facio, habeo gratiam; Hec. 560, siquidem non volt et tu sensti, aderam; Ad. 232, si hoc omitto ac tum agam, nil est; 979, processisti pulchre. : siquidem tu officium facies atque dederis.

Dependent Conditional Sentences.

Many conditional sentences are dependent either upon an infinitive (especially of indirect discourse) or upon a subordinate clause.

a) Dependent upon an infinitive: Asin. 97, promitto tibi non obfuturum, si effeceris; Aul. 344, te scio posse, si nil obviamst; 593; Bacch. 1195; Capt. 575, et me confido, si reconciliasso; Epid. 7, spondeo . . . me accepturum, si dabis; Men. 423, neque si venerit, eum volo intromitti; Merc. 797, eloquar me istanc protracturum esse in viam, nisi hinc abducit; M. G. 326; 453, nisi das fidem te huc, si omisero, ituram; 915; Trin. 53, credo te gaudere, si quid mihi mali est; And. 611, incolumem scio fore me, si devito hoc malum; H. T. 591; 881; Ad. 382, an laudi putat fore, si perdiderit? Cato, Agr. 39, 2, cogitato, si nihil fiet, nihilo minus sumptum futurum; And. 372, quasi necessus sit, si huic non dat, te illam ducere; Cato, Agr. 122, vinum concinnare, si transibit.

b) Dependent upon a subjunctive clause: Amph. 635, est placitum, plus mali adsit, boni si optigit quid; Capt. 747, quaeso, si rebitet, ut facias; 920, dicam ut ornet, si volet; Curc. 33, nemo

prohibet quin, si argentum est, emas; Epid. 310, metuo, si resciverit, ne ulmos parasitos faciat; Men. 880, omnes quaeso, si revenerit, ni indicetis; Merc. 586; Poen. 395; Pseud. 1019; Rud. 1257; 1294; Trin. 1012; 1042, metuo ne, si compellabo, aliam rem occipiat loqui; 1168; Truc. 780, edico ne habeatis, nisi si voltis; Eun. 501, fac cures, si forte advenerit, ut ores; Phor. 825; Hec. 387.

c) One protasis is frequently qualified by a second: XII Tab. 8, si membrum rupsit, ni cum eo pacit, talio esto; ibid. si nox furtum faxsit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto; Asin. 405, siquidem minis animisque expletus cedit, si med iratus tetigerit, iratus vapulabit; Aul. 442, si accesseris, nisi iussero, ego faciam; Bacch. 1001, si das, ille alium gerulum quaerat, si sapiet; Epid. 543, quid si adeam, si haec east; Merc. 819, si vir scortum duxit, id si rescivit uxor, in-punest viro; M. G. 306, (interii) si taceo tamen, si hoc palam fuerit; 341, si ea domist, si facio, dignun es? 1251, si amavit aut si sapientiam habet, per amorem si quid fecero, ignoscet; Pers. 294; Pseud. 723; Rud. 329, eadem, si scit, si videro, exquisivero; 727, si autem Veneri complacuerunt, habeat, si argentum dabit; 789, si te offendero, numquam quisquam me lenonem dixerit, si te non ludos dimissero; 810, si attigerit, ni invitassitis, periistis; Trin. 95, si scis me fecisse, si id non accusas, tute obiurigandus es.

d) Dependent upon a purpose clause: Epid. 279, ut amoveas, nisi tuast secus sententia; Men. 428; M. G. 248, ne titubet, si exquiret; Poen. 26; Rud. 700; And. 159, si quid consili habet, ut consumat; 316; Titin. 58, sin forma odio sum, tandem ut moribus placeam viro; Cato, Agr. 12.

e) Dependent upon an indirect question: Pseud. 109, scis, mea si commovi sacra, quo pacto soleam; Eun. 438, scin, si quando illa mentionem facit, te ut urat; Hec. 567; Turp. 129.

f) Dependent upon a temporal clause: Pseud. 1146, quom libella nusquamst, nisi leno hic subvenit tibi; 1261, ubi mammicula op-primitur aut, si lubet, corpora conduplicant; Enn. Ann. 262.

Substantive *Si*-Clauses.

Substantive *si*-clauses occur especially with *miror* and *mirum*, and as appositives of pronouns: Amph. 29, mirari non est aequom, sibi si praetimet; M. G. 1326, nil miror si lubenter hic eras; Bacch. 409;

Capt. 545; Cure. 265; Merc. 784; Pers. 619; Pseud. 442; H. T. 525, minime miror, hanc si deperit; 383; Cato, fr. Jord. 25, 5, idne irascimini si quis superbior est quam vos? M. G. 1041, hau mirum si te habes carum; Amph. 590, istaec miseriast si vi verum vincitur; Asin. 830, numquidnam tibi molestumst si haec accubat? M. G. 947, volup est si procedit; H. T. 1054, ea lege hoc adeo faciam, si facit; Eun. 382; Phor. 1040, adeone indignum tibi videtur, si habet unam amicam? Ad. 255, id demum iuvat, si is bene facit; 357.

"Concessive" *Si*-Clauses.¹

Many *si*-clauses in Plautus, and a few in Terence and other Early Latin writers, are "concessive," i.e. adversative, in character. It is not always easy to determine with precision what clauses have the adversative force. Nutting adds to Kriege's list, and I have felt constrained to do the same, though not accepting all of Nutting's examples. The following instances, will, I believe, be fairly complete for the early period. In many cases the adversative character is emphasized by the presence of an adversative particle (*at*, *tamen*, *saltem*).

a) With *at*, *tamen*, or *saltem* in the apodosis (18): Bacch. 365, si illi sunt virgae, at mihi tergum domist; 887, si tibist machaera, at nobis vervinast; Capt. 224, si erus tu mihi's, tamen viso opus est; 683, si peribo, at erit; Cas. 298, si sic nihil impetrare potero, saltem sortiar; Cist. 67, si non est, tamen dolet; Cure. 4, si media nox est sive prima vespera . . . tamen est eundum; Men. 746, si me derides, at pol illum non potes; Merc. 636, ubi habitaret invenires saltem, si nomen nequis; Poen. 51, sin odios, dicam tamen; Rud. 1361, si Iovis fuit, meus est tamen; Truc. 615, si tu bellator clues, at ego clueo; 832, qui inprobust si quasi bibit sive adeo caret temeto, tamen inprobust; Eun. 639, si illud non licet, saltem hoc licebit; 865, si digna sum, at tu indignus; Ad. 950, si multumst, tamen faciundumst; Lucil. 590, si maluerit, privabit tamen; Acc. 619, si a me regnum Fortuna eripere quivit, at virtutem nec quuit.

b) Without particle in the apodosis (23): Amph. 908, si dixi, nilo magis es; 929, si non iubes, ibo egomet; Capt. 529, neque Salus

¹ Kriege, *De enuntiatis concessivis apud Plautum et Terentium*, 1884; Nutting, *Studies in the Si-Clause*, University of California Publications, Classical Philology, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 35 ff.

servare, si volt, me potest; Epid. 599; Men. 670; 751, idem dicam si avom vis adducere; 1060; M. G. 519; 631; Most. 42, non omnes possunt olere unguenta exotica, si tu oles; 229; 914; Poen. 374, si ante quid mentitust, nunciam dehinc erit verax tibi; Rud. 1014, si tu proreta es, ego gubernator ero; 1075; 1353, si maxume mi illum reddiderit vidulum, non ego debeo triobolum; 1400, non istoc me intervortes, si aliam praedam perdidi; Stich. 287; Trin. 465, si sic non licebit, luscus dixero; 507; 607; Phor. 295, verum si cognatast maxume, non fuit necesse habere; Eun. 638, si non tangendi copias, ne videndi quidem erit?

It is worthy of note that the adversative force of the *si*-clause is occasionally emphasized by the presence of *maxume*. Thus: Rud. 1353; Phor. 295.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.¹

QUOM-CLAUSES.

Quom, 'when.'

A. THE *QUOM*-CLAUSE IS DESCRIPTIVE.

Instances of the descriptive *quom*-clause are not frequent. Examples are: Bacch. 417, iam aderit tempus quom se oderit; cf. Hec. 543, pol iam aderit, se quom oderit; Capt. 518, hic illest dies quom nulla salus sperabilest; Truc. 380, tempestas fuit quom inter nos sordebamus (*sorderemus* P); Ad. 384, videre videor diem illum quom profugiet; Enn. Ann. 262, nunc est ille dies quom gloria maxuma sese nobis ostentat; Capt. 303, memini quom haud audebat; Poen. 924, nunc est quom me commoror; And. 152, prope adest quom alieno more vivendumst mihi; Eun. 551, nunc est profecto interfici quom perpeti me possum; Stat. 119, nunc enim vero est quom meae morti remedium reperibit nemo.

B. THE *QUOM*-CLAUSE IS ADVERBIAL.

1. With the present indicative (100).

a) Referring to a single action in present time (18).

1) With *nunc*: Asin. 144, nunc quom est melius me ignoras;

¹ Autenrieth, Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie, Supplementbd. vi, p. 273; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 71 ff.; Hoffmann, Modus im lateinischen Zeitsatz; Lubbert, Die Syntax von *Quom*. The last two works are characterized by a perverted method.

Aul. 629, nunc quom compares, peris; Capt. 1022, nunc in memoriam regredior quom recogito; Merc. 178; Most. 588; Stich. 146; Trin. 504; Hec. 649, nunc non est (ambiguom) quom eam sequitur alienus puer; Ad. 738; H. T. 448.

2) Without *nunc*: Amph. 416, mihi non credo, quom illaec autumare illum audio; M. G. 1324, non queo quom te video; Poen. 283, quom ornatum aspicio, paenitet; Rud. 1279, non censet quom volo; Truc. 566; Acc. 346, me miserum, quom recordor, quom reminiscor.

b) Achronistic *quom*-clauses in expressions of general truths (60), e.g. Bacch. 548, se quom frustrant, frustrari alios existunt; Capt. 73, talos quom iacit scortum invocat; 78; 80; 255; 463; Epid. 147, mihi dolet quom vapulo; Men. 226, voluptas nullastnavitis maior quam quom terram conspiciunt; M. G. 646, tacere quom aliena est oratio; Pseud. 747, quid quom tenetur? 804; Stich. 124, quae, quom res secundae sunt, se poterit gnoscere; Trin. 523, terra quom proscinditur, boves moriuntur; And. 309, quom valemus, recta consilia aegrotis damus; Eun. 498, rideo, quom in mentem venit; Phor. 241; Cato, Agr. 17, 1, quom semen maturum habet, tum tempesta est; 54, 5, quom edunt, exspectant; Lucil. 371, quom tecum est, quidvis satis est.

c) Historical presents (19), e.g. Amph. 668, gravidam reliqui quom abeo; Capt. 282, vivom, quom inde abimus, liquimus; 887; Epid. 217, quom venio, atque illam video; Men. 1115, quot eras annos gnatus quom te pater avehit? Merc. 616, addicta erat quom venio; Stich. 511; Truc. 401, mater ancillas iubet, quom decumus mensis adventat, aliam aliorum ire; And. 362, quom advenio, solitudo ante ostium; H. T. 650, quom exponendam do, de digito anulum detraho; Eun. 342; 345; 792; Stat. 225, te, quom ad nos venis, subfarminatam vidi.

d) Present with future force (3); Capt. 724, quom alii octonos eefodiunt, nisi confeceris, Sescentoplago nomen indetur tibi; M. G. 891; Ad. 946, ego dicam, quom confit.

2. With the imperfect indicative (33).

a) With *modo*, *olim*, *tum*, in the main clause (7): Amph. 199, quom pugnabant maxume, tum fugiebam maxume; Asin. 205, longe aliam (linguam) praebes nunc atque olim quom dabam atque olim quom iniciebas me ad te; 207; 927, modo, quom dicta in me in-

gerebas, odium eram; Cist. 186; Trin. 1092, res quom animam agebat, tum esse offusam oportuit; And. 545, alium esse censes nunc me atque olim quom dabam?

b) Without particle in the main clause (26), e.g. Bacch. 421, erat haec disciplina quom tu adulescens eras? 469, quom peribat vidi; Capt. 247, ne me secus honestes quam quom servibas; Cure. 541, quom credebam, credidi te nihil esse redditurum; Epid. 432, quod factitavi in adulescentia, quom militabam; Men. 632; 1145; Merc. 753, quam te amare dixi quom opsonabas; Pseud. 500; Truc. 733; Eun. 308, scis te mihi saepe pollicitum esse, quom ad te congerebam; Plaut. Boeot. 6; Turp. 167; Cato, Agr. prooem. 2, quom laudabant, ita laudabant; Jord. 39, 7, quom Romam veniebant, prorsus devortebantur. This last example is the only instance of *quom* iterative with the imperfect indicative that I have noted in Early Latin.

3. With the future indicative (62).

a) Referring to a single act (30), e.g. Bacch. 518, tum quom nihilo pluris referet; Cas. 134, quom illa dicet, quom haec dicentur, tum tu in medio pariete vorsabere; Poen. 726, volo vos commeminisse mox quom usus veniet; Asin. 749, horrescet quom audiet; Bacch. 825, orabis me quom rescisces; Men. 996, praesto ero, quom venietis; M. G. 859; Pseud. 163, haec quom revortar facite ut offendam; H. T. 801, videbitur magis veri simile, quom dabit; Eun. 52, quom nemo expetet, venies; Phor. 695; Ad. 665, quid illi creditis fore quom videbit? Acc. 153.

b) In expressions containing general truths (32), only in Cato, de Agr. viz. 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto; 5, 8, quom exportabis, purgato; 17, 1, quom glubebit, tum tempestiva est; 23, 1, quom pluet, quala parentur; 94, quom ver adpetet, terram exaggerato.

4. With the perfect indicative (50).

a) Present perfect (6): Capt. 142, tum denique nostra intellegimus bona, quom ea amisimus; 256, etiam quom cavissee ratus est, saepe captus est; Epid. 227, tributus quom imperatus est, negant; Most. 277, itidem olent quasi quom una multa iura confudit coquos; Pers. 436; Pseud. 401.

b) With the historical perfect (44).

1) With some temporal particle or phrase (*tum, tunc, ibi, inde, olim*, etc.) in the main clause (10), e.g. Bacch. 960, ibi occidi Troilum

quom censuit; Men. 447, numquam feci peius quam hodie quom contionem me inmersi; Rud. 846, in ara tunc sedebant quom ad me profectu's ire? And. 883, olim quom ita animum inducti tuom, eodem die istuc verbum in te accidit; H. T. 54, inde adeo quom agrum mercatus es; 262; Phor. 912; Hec. 411, ea me abstinuisse in principio, quom datast; 537; Lucil. 175, quom id nil visus facere est, tum retia nexit.

2) Without temporal particle in the main clause (34), e.g., Amph. 91, histriones quom Iovem invocarunt, venit; Poen. 723, vidistis quom accepit? 904, adoptavit hunc quom diem obiit suom; 1070; Trin. 194, posticulum hoc recepit quom aedes vendidit; 872; Phor. 9, si intellegeret, quom stetit olim nova, actoris opera stetisse; 31; 815, perliberalis visast quom vidi; Hec. 1, quom datast nova, intervenit vitium; 572; Enn. Trag. 189, quom illuc ventumst, ire illuc lubet; Pacuv. 65; 328.

5. With the pluperfect indicative.

I have noted but four examples of this tense in Early Latin: Bacch. 426, id quom (*quoi*, codd.) optigerat, hoc etiam accersebatur; Cas. 461, quom ei advorsum veneram, facere atriensem voluerat sub ianua; And. 517, quom intellexeras, quor non dixti? 838, egomet vidi iurgantem ancillam. : : scio. : : vero vultu, quom neuter prae-senserat.

6. With the future perfect indicative (32).

a) Referring to a single action (22), e.g. Bacch. 359, quom sciverit, quid fiet postea? Poen. 405, mox dabo, quom rediero; Amph. 197, meditabor quo modo illi dicam quom illo advenero; 466; Bacch. 358, quid futurumst quom resciverit? Capt. 434; Merc. 649, quom veneris, aufugies? 1003; Rud. 766, quid quom inveneris? H. T. 484, quod quomque inciderit in mentem, volet; 557; Eun. 1067, quod quom dixero, facitote; Phor. 185; Hec. 300, quod quom ita esse invenero, quid restat? 474; 694; Enn. Praet. 5, quom spolia detraxeritis, quam inscriptionem dabitis? Lucil. 590, hoc quom feceris, non derit; Afran. 228, ea, quom venero, confecta ut offendam; Turp. 193.

b) In expressions containing general truths (10), only in Cato, de Agr. e.g. 22, 4, quom advexeris, temperato; 38, 4, quom subdideris, oblinito; 96, quom detonderis, unguito; 98, 2.

In the following the future is combined with the future perfect, H. T. 726, *quom dixero et constituero, quom is certe renuntiavit*, Clitipho *quom in spe pendebit animi, decipiam ac non veniam*; Cato, Agr. 25, *quom vinum coctum erit et quom legetur, facito*; 98, 2, *quom unxeris, quom uti voles, extergeto*.

Quom extemplo.

a) With the present: Amph. 865, *huc autem quom extemplo adventum adporto, ilico Amphitruo fio*; Bacch. 303, *tristes ilico quom extemplo vident, subducunt lembum*; Merc. 295, *senex quom extemplo est, iam nec sentit*.

b) With the future: M. G. 933, *hanc ad nos, quom extemplo a foro veniemus, mittitote*.

c) With the perfect: Most. 101, *aedes quom extemplo sunt paratae, laudant fabrum*; Trin. 242, *quom extemplo percussist, ilico res foras labitur*; 492, *quom extemplo emisimus, aequo mendicis censeatur censu*.

d) With the future perfect: Capt. 786, *quom extemplo advenero, loquentur*; M. G. 1176, *quom extemplo hoc erit factum, ibi tu ilico facito*; Trin. 725, *quom extemplo arcum sumpsero, — dormibo*.

Quom primum.

Quom primum, 'as soon as,' occurs Eun. 509, *me video ab ea labefactarier iam tum quom primum iussit*; Hec. 33, *quom primum coepi, fecere ut exirem*. In a different sense: Cas. 17, *haec quom primum acta est, vicit omnis*; And. 1, *quom primum animum ad scribendum adpulit, id sibi negoti credidit solum dari*.

Quom puto, quom cogito, etc., in Elliptical Expressions.

In *quom puto* and many similar expressions the *quom*-clause depends not upon the main clause of the sentence, but upon something to be supplied in thought. Thus Amph. 441, *quom illum contemplo et formam cognosco meam, nimis similit mei*; i.e. 'when I look at him and consider my own figure, I find that he is like me.' So in the following: Amph. 447, *quom cogito, idem sum qui semper fui*; Bacch. 449, *quom huius dicta intellego, mira sunt ni*; 597, *quom huius verba interpretor, mihi cautiost*; Capt. 51, *homunculi quanti sunt quom recogito*! Cas. 555, *quom puto, si quid eius esset, esset mecum*

postulatio; 910, quom cogito, non habuit; Cist. 316, quom interpretor, haec est quae; Cure. 375, quom recogito, sufferam; 583, verba mihi dedit, quom cogito; Men. 254, quom inspicio marsuppiū, viaticati aestive sumus; 1064, haud est dissimilis, quom formam noscito; Merc. 742; M. G. 1375; Rud. 771, quom coniecturam facio, haec est illa simia; Stich. 301; 448; Trin. 256, haec quom reputo, apage te; 404; Truc. 452; H. T. 387, quom considero, mirabilest.

Quom Inversum.

I have noted only the following instances of *quom inversum*: Aul. 520, hos absolutos censeas quom incedunt; Men. 1054, tu clamabas quom accurro; Eun. 633, longe abieram quom sensi; Enn. Com. 3, quom desubito me orat mulier; Catulus, Baehr. p. 276, constiteram forte salutans, quom subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.

Quom Explicative.

I have noted about forty instances of *quom explicative*, the somewhat inexact traditional name for those *quom*-clauses which indicate that one act or condition is identical with another. Examples:

a) Present (27), e.g. Aul. 194, petit quom pollicetur; Capt. 615, Aiace, hunc quom vides, ipsum vides; Cist. 692, memet moror quom hoc ago; Epid. 344, mihi cesso quom sto; 691; Men. 156, te morare mihi quom obloquere; 298, pro sano loqueris, quom me appellas nomine; Merc. 468; M. G. 1070; Poen. 589, bene facitis quom operam datis; 760; Pseud. 931, occidis me quom rogitas; Trin. 342, quom illi dico, praemonstro tibi; Truc. 273, nunc places, quom mi inclementer dicis; And. 18, quom hunc accusant, Naevium accusant; 421, facis ut te decet, quom impetro; Ad. 96, quom illi dico, tibi dico.

b) Imperfect: Epid. 138, desipiebam, quom mittebam; Com. Frag. p. 138, Ribb. quom simulabat, tum detulit.

c) Perfect (12), e.g. Bacch. 166, fecisti furtum in aetatem malum quom istaec flagitia me celavisti; 677, errasti quom parum immersti ampliter; 925, eluent fecisse facinus maximum quom Pergamum subegerunt; Capt. 297, fecit officium quom tibi est confessus; 452, rem constabilivi quom illos emi; Cas. 841, bona multa mihi dedisti, quom huius copiam mi dedisti; Men. 668; 701.

Substantive *Quom*-Clauses.

In a few instances the *quom*-clause has substantive force, viz.: Cas. 39, abhinc annos factum est xvi quom conspicatust puellam exponi; Most. 694, non forte visum fuit quom dedit; Poen. 1203, hoc maxumumst (sc. vitium), quom sibi placent; Hec. 308, saepe est quom eadem causast factus inimicissumus.

***Quom*, 'since' ('seitdem').**

In the following passages *quom* has the force of 'since': Amph. 302, iam diust quom (codd. *quod*) vietum non datis, 'it is a long time that you have refused me sustenance;' Aul. 4, iam multos annos est quom possideo; Merc. 533, biennium est, quom mecum rem coepit; 535, iam biennium est quom tecum rem habet; 541, haud diust quom dentes exciderunt; Most. 470, quia vii menses sunt quom in hasce aedes pedem nemo intro tetulit; Pers. 137, non vi menses huc est quom commigravit; Trin. 402, minus xv dies sunt quom xl minas accepisti; Cato fr. (Jord.), p. 15, 9, non longinqua memoria est quom in arbore ensem viderunt quem Orestes reliquisse dicitur.

Apparently related, though logically obscure, are the three following examples: Asin. 251, iam diust factum quom discesti atque abistii; 890, iam dudum factumst quom primum bibi; Trin. 1010, iam dudum factumst quom abiisti domo. Logically these seem substantive clauses, serving as the subject of *factum est*.

***Quom*, 'while.'**

I have noted but a single instance of this usage, viz. Bacch. 1122, pastor dormit, quom eunt palitantes.

***Quom interea*, *quom interim*.**

In the three following passages *quom interea* (*quom interim*) is used to introduce a circumstantial clause: Men. 446, plus xxx annis natus sum, quom interea loci numquam quicquam feci peius quam hodie; Pers. 172, te iam sector quintum annum quom interim nondum edidicisti; Hec. 421, dies xxx in navi fui quom interea semper mortem exspectabam.

Quom magis . . . (magis).

In the following passages *quom magis* (*magis quom*) is used with the force of *quo magis*: M. G. 935, *magis quom periculum facies, magis nosces*; Most. 702, *quom magis cogito, . . . neminem sollicitat*; Pers. 564, *quom magis contemplo, magis placet*.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *UBI*¹**1. With the present indicative (79).**

a) Referring to present time: Rud. 441, *ut timeo, ubi intueor*; Ad. 444, *ubi video, vivere etiam nunc lubet*.

b) In expressions of general truths (41).

1) With correlative particle in main clause (12): Aul. 197, *ubi manum inicit, ibi onerat aliquam zamiam*; Epid. 166 a, *ubi pudendumst, ibi eos deserit pudor*; Most. 105, *ubi illo inmigrat nequam homo, hic iam aedibus vitium additur*; 379, *miserum est opus igitur demum fodere puteum ubi sitis faucis tenet*; Pers. 304, *ubi se adiuvat, ibi me adiuvat*; 614, *tibi ibidem das, ubi tuum amicum adiuvas*; Pseud. 311, *ilico vixit amator, ubi supplicat*; Stich. 733, *tecum ubi est, mecum ibi est*; And. 631, *ubist tempus promissa iam perfici, tum se aperiunt*; 638, *nil pudet hic ubi opus est*; *ibid. ubi nil opust, ibi verentur*; Cato, Agr. 45, 3, *ubi trimae sunt, tum denique maturae sunt*.

2) Without correlative particle (29), e.g. Bacch. 251, *cor meum finditur, ubi fit quomque mentio*; Capt. 234, *ubi habent, pessumi fiunt*; 500, *ubi vident, eunt obviam*; Pers. 313, *ubi qui tangit, dolores cooriuntur*; Pseud. 819, *ubi coquont, condimentis non condiunt*; Stich. 732, *mecum ubi est, tecum est*; H. T. 154, *quod fit, ubi non vere vivitur*; Eun. 600, *ita ut fit ubi domini absunt*; 630; Phor. 715, *ut cautus est, ubi nil opust*; Cato, Agr. 6, 1, *ubi ager crassus est, sic observari oportet*; 114; 157, 7. — *Ubi quando*: Capt. 290, *ubi quando sacrificat, Samiis vasis utitur*.

c) With the historical present (26).

1) With correlative particles: Cist. 160, *is ubi scit, ilico aufugit*; And. 356, *ubi non invenio, ibi ascendo*; H. T. 276, *ubi aperit, continuo se coniecit intro*.

¹ Schubert, Temporalconjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 20 ff.

2) Without correlative particles (23), e.g. Amph. 1061, *ubi parturit, deos invocat*; Bacch. 289, *ubi eximus, homines sequi*; Cas. 922; Poen. 1284, *ubi nec leno nec illae redeunt, abii*; H. T. 128, *ubi video, haec coepi*; 303, *quid ait, ubi me nominas?* 304; Eun. 260, *ubi videt, homo coepit*; 414; Phor. 862, *ubi ire occipio, puer ad me adeurrit*; Acc. 602, *ubi adveniunt, nitidantur*; Enn. Ann. 45; Turp. 194.

d) Referring to the future (10): XII Tab. 1, *rem ubi pacunt, orato*; Bacch. 995, *ubi lubet, recita*; Epid. 39, *tu ipse ubi lubet, finem face*; Eun. 460, *ubi vis, non moror*; 464; 814; 1088; Phor. 907, *ubi voltis, uxorem date*; Cato, Agr. 158, 1, *ubi incipit, addito*.

2. With the imperfect indicative (5).

Examples: Bacch. 685, *quid, ubi reddebas aurum, dixisti patri?* M. G. 856, *ubi bacchabatur aula, cassabant cadi*; Trin. 503, *ubi usus nil erat, dicebat*; Eun. 405, *requiescere ubi volebat, quasi . . . nostin?* Plaut. Fr. 26, *ubi is te monebat*. Of the foregoing examples, M. G. 856; Fr. 26; and Eun. 405 exhibit iterative force.

3. With the future indicative (73).

a) Referring to a single act (31).

1) With correlative particles (13): Epid. 595, *ubi voles pater esse, ibi esto*; 423, *ubi erit otium, revertere ad me extemplo*; 154, *ubi scibit, continuo orabit*: Pers. 653, *actutum, ubi sciet, aderit*; 728, *ubi videbis, tum facito*; Poen. 298; Rud. 426; 930, *iam ubi liber ero, igitur demum instruam agrum*; Truc. 871; H. T. 972, *ubi scies, tum istoc utitor*; Eun. 440, *ubi nominabit Phaedriam, tu Pamphilam continuo*; Ad. 526, *ubi non videbit, iam huc recurret*.

2) Without correlative particles (18), e.g. Capt. 341, *alium misero, ubi erunt indutiae*; Men. 257, *ubi nihil habebis, gemes*; Pers. 468, *ubi videbis, id erit adeundi tempus*; Rud. 933 a, *ubi nobilitas mea clara erit, oppidum communibo*; Truc. 189; H. T. 754, *ubi videbit, optabit rursum*; Eun. 52, *ubi non poteris, venies*; Phor. 48.

b) In general expressions — chiefly in Cato — (42), e.g. Truc. 879, *ubi metues malum, fugito ad me*; And. 848, *ubi voles, accerse*; Cato, Agr. 18, 6, *aram ubi facies, fundamenta facito*; 48, 1, *ubi seres, vortito*; 53; 54, 3; 127, *ubi florebit, conligito*.

4. With the perfect indicative (85).

a) Present perfect (36).

1) With correlative participles (8): Aul. 525, ubi res solutast, ibi cedit miles; Capt. 77, ubi res prolatae sunt, simul prolatae res sunt nostris dentibus; Most. 131, ubi emeritum est stipendium, tum specimen cernitur; 276, ubi sese sudor consociavit, ilico olent; Poen. 106, ubi est ingressus, ilico omnes meretrices invenit; Phor. 1010, ubi ad uxores ventumst, tum fiunt senes; Cato, Agr. 3, 1, ubi aetas accessit, tum aedificare oportet.

2) Without correlative particle (28), e.g. Asin. 304, ubi manus manicae complexae sunt, nec dependes nec propendes; Aul. 198, ubi tetigerunt, tenent; Bacch. 471; Curc. 60; 293; Rud. 984, ubi demisi retem, extraho; Truc. 301; H. T. 220, ubi adbibit plus paulo, sua quae narrat facinora! 390; 392; Hec. 242, ubi duxere, easdem exigunt; Cato, Agr. 2, 1, ubi venit, ubi salutavit, circum eat; 2, 2, ubi cognovit, vocet; ibid. ubi dixit, revoca; 157, 7.

It will be noted that none of these perfects are true present perfects, i.e. they do not denote an action completed in present time. They are either achronistic, or, where the main clause refers to the future, serve as future perfects, as in Cato, Agr. 2, 1; 2, 2.

b) Historical perfect (49).

1) With correlative particles (15), e.g. Amph. 216, haec ubi legati pertulere, castris ilico producit exercitum; 242, hoc ubi conspicatus est, ilico equites iubet inducere; Bacch. 960, ubi tabellas ad senem detuli, ibi occidi Troilum; Capt. 559, credidi esse insanum extemplo, ubi te appellavit; Cas. 881, ubi deduxi, recta via abduxi; Cist. 137; 577, ubi elocutast, ego continuo interrogo; Curc. 363; H. T. 279, hic sciri potuit, ubi de improvisost interventum mulieri; 616, dixi, ubi mi ostendisti, ilico: 891; Eun. 1015, quid illi credis tum animi fuisse, ubi vidit? Stat. 160, ubi domum adveni, adsedi, extemplo savium dat.

2) Without correlative particles (34), e.g. Aul. 15, ubi is mortem obiit, coepi observare; 708, ubi ille abiit, ego me duco de arbore; Bacch. 265, quid, ubi ostendit symbolum? M. G. 123, ubi aspexit me, mihi signum dedit; Trin. 853, ubi conduxit, abduxit domum; Truc. 506, ubi natust, machaeram poscebat; And. 173, ita sensi, ubi audivit; H. T. 199; 121, ubi comperi, domum revortor; Eun. 165, nonne ubi dixti quaesivi? Phor. 866; Hec. 20, ubi sunt cognitae, placitae sunt; Enn. Trag. 72; Lucil. 626.

5. With the pluperfect indicative (3).

Examples: Asin. 209, *ubi quid dederam, quasi columbae pulli in ore meo eratis*; Phor. 572, *quid tam diu commorabare, ubi id audieras?* Hec. 130, *ubi quomque datum erat spatium solitudinis, "Parmeno,"* (inquit). The first and third of these examples have iterative force.

6. With the future perfect indicative (130).

a) Referring to a single act (60).

1) With correlative particle (12), e.g. Bacch. 708, *hoc ubi egero, tum istuc agam*; Cas. 547, *ubi nuptiae fuerint, tum convenibo*; Men. 142, *iam sciam, ubi videro*; M. G. 1176, *ubi abierit, ibi tu ilico facito*; Pers. 162, *ubi ego accepero, continuo tu adserito*; Poen. 188, *ubi expolivero, magis tum demum dices*; Rud. 818, *ubi advenierit, itote extemplo*; Stich. 594, *ubi convivae abierint, tum venias*; Hec. 813; Ad. 203, *ubi dixero, testis faciet ilico*; 232, *si . . . tum agam, ubi rediero*.

2) Without correlative particle (48), e.g. Aul. 623, *ego mihi bibam, ubi id fecero*; Bacch. 757, *ubi erit accubitum, ne quoquam assurgatis*; 765; M. G. 946, *ne quid, ubi miles venerit, titubet*; 1169; Pseud. 750, *ubi te aspexerit, narrabit*; And. 837, *ubi causa erit adempta, desinent*; Eun. 55, *eludet, ubi senserit*; 596, *ubi nos laverimus, lavato*; Phor. 47, *ferietur alio munere, ubi era pepererit*; 143; 718; 892; Hec. 155, *illam spero, ubi cognoverit, abituram denique*; 791; Ad. 226; 378; Trabea, 3.

b) In general expressions (70), only in Cato, de Agr.

1) With correlative particles (3): Cato, Agr. 38, 3, *ubi foderis tum facito*; 83, *ubi res divina facta erit, statim consumito*; 112, 2, *ubi pluerit, tum delegito*.

2) Without correlative particles (67), e.g. Cato, Agr. 17, 1, *ubi solstitium fuerit, tempestita est*; 21, 2, *ubi feceris, circumplectito*; 26, *ubi erit lectum, oblinito*; 38, 4, *ubi combusseris, serito*; 50, 2; 57, *ubi facta erit, bibant*.

7. With combinations of two tenses: Poen. 853, *tibi reddam operam, ubi voles, ubi iusseris*; Pseud. 1259, *ubi amans complexust amantem, ubi labella adiungit, etc.*; Cato, Agr. 45, 3, *ubi trimae sunt, tum denique maturae sunt, ubi liber vortet*.

Ubi primum.

I have noted the eight following examples of *ubi primum*: Amph. 203, *ubi primum terram tetigimus, continuo Amphitruo delegit viros principes*; Cist. 137; Men. 599, *ubi primum est licitum, ilico properavi*; M. G. 109, *ubi primum evenit occasio, sublimit os*; Poen. 1419, *quando ire cogitas? : : ubi primum potero, ilico*; Plaut. Frag. 30, *ubi primum accensus clamarat meridiem*; Eun. 628, *ubi primum poterit, se subducet*; Cato, Agr. 17, 2, *ubi primum incipiunt, tum legi oportet*.

Extemplo ubi.

Extemplo ubi occurs: Bacch. 977, *vendam extemplo ubi oppidum expugna-vero*; Capt. 559; Cure. 80, *extemplo ubi vino has conspersi fores, adesce me scit*; cf. Stat. 160.

Ubi with Conditional Force.

In a few instances *ubi* seems to have nearly or quite the force of *si*, viz. Cas. 825, *malo maximo suo, ubi tantillum peccassit*; Most. 255, *ubi tu commoda es, capillum commodum esse credito*; H. T. 208, *ubi se cupiditate devinxit, necessest consilia consequi consimilia*; Acc. 418, *qui potis est refelli quisquam, ubi nullust causandi locus?* Afran. 33, *parentum est vita vilis liberis, ubi malunt metui quam vereri se ab suis*; M. G. 915, *hoc cogitato, ubi probus est architectus, facile esse navem facere*; Capt. 955.

Substantive Clauses introduced by *Ubi*.

In the two following passages the *ubi*-clause has substantive force: Aul. 184, *non temerariumst ubi dives blande appellat pauperem*; Cato, Agr. 38, 4, *hoc signi erit, ubi calx cocta erit*.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUANDO*.¹

1. With the present indicative (25).

a) Referring to present time, M. G. 1328, *quom ego, quando aspicio, lacruno*; Truc. 817, *nunc non tacebo quando adest*.

b) Achronistic in general expressions (17): Amph. 123, *vorsipellem se facit quando lubet*; 862, *Mercurius fit quando commodumst*; 864,

¹ Scherer, *De quando particula*, Studemund's Studien, ii, p. 130 ff.; Schubert, *Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus*, 1881, p. 16 ff.; Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, 1892, p. 76.

fio Iupiter quando lubet; Asin. 289, pro monstro est quando qui sudat tremit. Here the *quando*-clause is almost conditional in force and has substantive value. Asin. 301, centum pondo es quando pendes; 323, quando usus est, qui malum fert fortiter; Capt. 336, quam imber est quando pluit; Men. 78, quia mensam quando edo detergeo; 302, qui cyathisso quando potas; 926, quando essurio, tum crepant; Stich. 201, quando quem auctionem facturum sciunt, adeunt, perquirunt; 217, ridiculus aequè nullust, quando essurit; Trin. 671, quando eius copias, tum non velis; Truc. 241, quando sterilis est amator, soli credimus; Titin. 128, quando fervit, confutat; Naev. Com. 26, ille ipse astat, quando edit. In Cas. 206, sine amet, quando tibi domi nil deliquit est, *quando* seems to be used in the sense of *quam diu*.

c) Referring to the future (6): Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt; Cas. 829, age, quando vis, uxorem accipe; Men. 215, quando vis, veni; 422, quando vis, eamus; M. G. 363, age, quando lubet; Pseud. 546, indice ludos, quando lubet.

2. With the imperfect indicative: only Pseud. 1180, in vigiliam quando ibat miles, conveniebatne in vaginam tuam machaera militis?

3. With the future indicative (19).

Examples: Capt. 231, scire memento, quando... habebis; 406, quando sciet, numquam erit tam avarus quin; Men. 73; 270; 430, auferto tecum, quando abibis; 547; 984, prope est quando pretium exsolvet. This last is a descriptive clause. Men. 1034, quando ibis, una tecum ibo; M. G. 772, quando habebo, rationem dabo; 810; Most. 98, quando audietis, haud aliter dicetis; 403, neu quisquam responset, quando pultabit senex; Pseud. 257; ibid. ducito quando habebis; 646, quando eum censebo domi, rediero; Stich. 475; Trin. 788, epistulas quando adferet, nonne arbitraris? Liv. And. 12, quando dies adveniet; Enn. Ann. 281, nox quando volabit.

4. With the perfect indicative (19).

a) Present perfect (18): Asin. 216, quando auceps concinnavit aream, offundit cibum; 303, ad pedes quando adligatumst centumpondium, nec dependes nec propendes; Aul. 249, quando occasio periit, post sero cupis; 753; Capt. 86, quando res redierunt, (sumus) Molossici; Merc. 169; M. G. 753; Most. 87, disputavi hominem quous rei, quando natus est, similem esse arbitrari; 91; Pers. 637, omne ego pro nihilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit; 638, tamquam homi-

nem, quando animam eeflavit; Pseud. 831, cocilendrum quando indidi, se patinae fervefaciunt; Truc. 36, quando abiit rete pessum, adducit lineam; 101; 750; Pacuv. 38, canis quando est percussa lapide, non appetit. In the two following, *quando* has the force of 'now that': Stich, 723 a, quando bibisti, refer ad labeas tibias; Trin. 616, ut agro evortat, quando evortit aedibus.

b) Historical perfect: Poen. 458, quando noluit, pausam feci.

5. **With the pluperfect indicative:** Epid. 434, eradicabam hominum auris, quando oceperam (an iterative use).

6. **With the future perfect indicative (13).**

Examples: Amph. 1097, absolvito me quando satis deluseris; Aul. 77, quam ut faciam, quando obstrinxero; Capt. 691, quando te excruciaro, vel te interiisse praedicent; Cas. 109; 120; Curc. 364, laudato, quando illud quod cupis effecero; Men. 664, opera reddetur quando quid tibi erit surruptum; M. G. 524, quando exierit, cito transeurrito; Most. 689, tum accedam, quando invenero; Pers. 730; Rud. 755; Stich. 382; Truc. 417, quid me futurumst quando venerit?

Quandoque.

A single instance of *quandoque* occurs in Cato fr. (Jord.), 77, 4, *quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet.*

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUONIAM*,¹

1. **Present tense (16).** Most of the examples are of the historical present, viz.: Aul. 9, quoniam moritur, numquam indicare id filio voluit suo; Bacch. 290, quoniam sentio, navem extemplo statuimus; 292, quoniam vident, oceperunt navem tardare; 299, quoniam videmus, capimus consilium; Men. 481, quoniam sentio errare, coepi adsentari; Poen. 68, quoniam videt, conicetur in morbum; 665, aufugit, quoniam capitur oppidum; Rud. 67, quoniam video virginem asportarier, tetuli ei auxilium; Stich. 411, quoniam videt, in amicitiam convortimus; Trin. 112, quoniam iturust, mihi commendavit; 149, quoniam hinc est profecturus peregre Charmides, thensaurum demonstravit; Pacuv. 392, quoniam ille interit, imperium Cefalo transmissum est; Cas. 583; Trin. 14; Truc. 402.

In the following passage the *quoniam*-clause refers to the future: Rud. 1050, quoniam adsum, faciet nemo iniuriam.

¹ Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, 1892, p. 22.

2. With the perfect tense (7): Asin. 350, quoniam ille elocutus haec — ; Bacch. 673, quid, quoniam occasio ad eam rem fuit? Capt. 30, quoniam indauidivit, nihil pretio parsit; M. G. 129, quoniam inspexi mulieris sententiam, cepi tabellas; Most. 1050, quoniam convocavi, atque segregant; Stich. 676, quoniam nuntiatum est, festinamus; Acc. Praetextae, 17, quoniam corpus dedi, visum est. Here *quoniam* has the force of *postquam*.

All of the foregoing examples are of the historical perfect.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *UT*.¹

Ut temporal has different meanings as follows: (1) 'when'; (2) 'since' ('seitdem'); (3) 'after,' = *postquam*.

A. *Ut*, 'when.'

1. With the present indicative: Men. 522, satin ut quemque conspicio, ita me ludificant? Merc. 100, ut imus, ecce ad me advenit.

2. With the imperfect indicative (5): Asin. 343, in tonstrina ut sedebam, infit; Men. 63, rus ut ibat, rapidus raptori subduxit pedes; Merc. 216, quidque ut dicebam, mihi credebatur; Ad. 406, ut numerabatur argentum, intervenit homo; Vid. 92, ut piscabar, ici vidulum.

3. With the perfect indicative (25).

a) Present perfect: M. G. 1264, omnes te amant ut quaeque aspexit; Most. 220, eundem animum oportet nunc mihi esse gratum, ut impetravi. In the second of these *ut* has the force of 'now that.'

b) Historical perfect (23): Amph. 203, ut illo advenimus, continuo delegit viros principes; 602, ut me praemisisti, ante aedis stabam; Aul. 705, ut dudum hinc abii, adveni; Bacch. 278, ut adsedi in stega, atque conspicio; 374; 388; Capt. 478, ut dudum abii, accessi; Epid. 14; Men. 1112; Merc. 187; Poen. 650, ut processimus, atque videmus; Rud. 914; And. 590, ut hinc te intro ire iussi, hic fit mi obviam; Phor. 617; Hec. 251, ut veni, incertum amisti; 345; 365; Liv. And. Trag. 2, ut Pergama accensa et praeda partita est; Naev. Trag. 41; Enn. Ann. 28, ut attulit lumen, memorat. — With *ut semel* (*semel ut*): Turp. 161, te semel ut nacta est, semper studuit perdere; Volc. Sedig. p. 280 (Baehr.), navem ut semel conscendit, visus numquam est; Lucil. 702, ut semel vidi.

¹ Schubert, Temporalconjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 10; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, p. 67 ff.

4. With the pluperfect indicative (11): Aisn. 408, Libanum ut iusseram venire, nullus venit; Bacch. 957, dudum primo ut dixeram mendacium, signum ex arce abstuli; Cure. 645, iam ut me conlocaverat, ventus exoritur; Men. 63, (rus ut ibat), ut pluerat; Most. 484, ut foris cenaverat tuos gnatus, abimus omnes; Poen. 486, ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam; Hec. 378, ut exieram (codd *exirem*), ad genua accidit; 802, ut quisque venerat, accedebam; Ad. 618, ut hinc forte ad obstetricem erat missa, accedo; Acc. 263, ut cuique obviam fuerat; Turp. 185, forte eo die meretricis ad me delenificae ut Atticae convenerant condixerantque cenam apud me.

5. With the future perfect indicative: only Truc. 330, ut properet suade, iam ut satis laverit.

B. *Ut*, 'since.'

A few instances of *ut*, 'since,' occur, viz.: Amph. 733, neque pedem intuli in aedis ut profectus sum eosque ut vicinus; Men. 635, ut dudum divorti, redeo nunc demum primum; Merc. 388, huc ut sum advectus, animus mihi dolet; Most. 470, pedem nemo intro intulit, semel ut emigravimus; Stich. 29, ut abierunt, hic tertius annus est; Hec. 751, pollicerer segregatum habuisse, uxorem ut duxit, a me Pamphilum.—*Ut primum*: Epid. 600, ut primum vidi, numquam vidi postea.

C. *Ut*, 'after.'

This usage seems to occur in Vole. Sedig. p. 280 (Baehr), ut Afer populo sex dedit comoedias, iter hinc in Asiam fecit.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *DUM*.¹

In temporal clauses *dum* has the meanings: 'while,' 'as long as,' 'till.' Besides this we have several instances of *dum* circumstantial.

A. *Dum*, 'while.'

English 'while' has two meanings. It may indicate that one act is co-extensive in time with another, as 'While there is life, there is hope;' i.e. 'As long as there is life.' Or 'while' may indicate that one act occurs *in the course* of another, as, 'While these things were happening, an hour passed by.' It is *dum* in the latter of these two

¹ Elste, De *dum* particulae usu Plautino, 1882; Richardson, De *dum* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1886; Schmalz, Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, xi, p. 338 ff.; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 77 ff.

senses that is considered under the present category. The force of the particle is often further indicated by *interim*, *interea*.

1. With the present indicative (105).

a) Referring to present time (i.e. to the time of the speaker's present (28); e.g. Amph. 113, *nox est facta longior, dum voluptatem capit*; Men. 878, *quid cesso, dum licet?* Merc. 778, *dari potest interea dum illi ponunt*; M. G. 1317; Most. 20, *dum lubet, pota*; Pers. 811, *delude erus dum abest*; Poen. 41, *dum ludi fiunt inruptiones facite*; 42; 491, *dum referuntur, volo narrare*; 914, *nisi, dum calet, hoc agitur*; Pseud. 921; Stich. 764, *da mihi savium, dum illic bibit*; Truc. 630, *cesso me hinc amoliri, dum licet*; 887, *quem amo, — dum inde aufero*; And. 556, *oro ut ante eamus, dum tempus datur*; 597, *potes nunc dum animus inritatus est*; H. T. 345, *fruare dum licet*; Eun. 56, *dum est tempus, cogita*; Phor. 549; Hec. 746, *quaere dum tempus est*; Lucil. 595, *salve dum licet*.

b) The *dum*-clause is achronistic (6): Bacch. 816, *quem di diligunt adulescens moritur, dum valet, sentit, sapit*; Cure. 170, *ipsus se exeruciat qui homo quod amat videt nec potitur dum licet*; Pers. 113, *dum mane est, esse decet*; 363, *dum tunicas ponit, quanta adificitur miseria*; And. 266, *dum in dubiis animus, paulo momento impellitur*; Phor. 341, *dum tibi fit quod placeat, ille ringitur*.

c) The *dum*-clause is equivalent to a present perfect, the main clause being either a present perfect or a present with the force of a present perfect (13):

1) With present perfect in main clause: Cure. 409, *istoc nomine, dum scribo, explevi ceras quattuor*; Epid. 650, *ego frater factus (sum), dum intro eo et exeo?* 670, *ita dum te sequor, invaserunt in genua flemina*; M. G. 1271, *dum te optuetur, interim linguam oculi praeciderunt*; Pers. 448, *dum stas, reditum oportuit*; Poen. 362, *dum exspecto, neque aliam paravi copiam neque, etc.*; Trin. 30, *dum illi aegrotant, mores mali succerevere*; H. T. 242; 257, *dum patria careo, tu conlocupletavisti te*; Eun. 949, *perdidisti istum adolescentulum, dum studes dare verba nobis*; Ad. 691, *dum dubitas menses abierunt*.

2) With present (= present perfect) in main clause: H. T. 240, *dum moliuntur, annus est*; Stat. 147, *dum eius mortem inhio, inter vivos vivo mortuos*.

d) The *dum*-clause is an historical present (45), e.g. Amph. 1120, *dum haec aguntur*, exclamat; Bacch. 279, *dum circumspecto*, atque conspicor; Cas. 241; 909, *dum quaero*, arripio capulum; Merc. 193, *dum haec aguntur*, advehitur pater; Trin. 166, *ruri dum sum*, inscribit; Eun. 255, *dum haec loquimur*, concurrunt laeti omnes; 328; 583; 592, *dum haec mecum reputo*, accersitur virgo; Phor. 91, *dum sedemus*, intervenit adulescens; Enn. Ann. 182, *dum censent* terrere minis, hortantur ibei sos; Amph. 1098, *dum haec aguntur*, audivimus; Bacch. 950, *paene interiit*, *dum exquiri*; Cas. 976; Cist. 90, *dum redeo*, consecutast; Curc. 682, *decem minas dum solvit*, omnis mensas transiit; Men. 449, *dum hieto*, se supterduxit; Merc. 97, *dum in portu ambulo*, hospes me adgnovit; Stich. 366, *dum percontor*, conspicatus sum; H. T. 272, *dum narrat*, audivi; 491, *somnum oculis non vidi*, *dum quaero*; 983, *id egi*, *dum loquitur*; Eun. 341, *dum haec dicit*, abiit hora; 629; Ad. 541, *dum quaero*, mercennarium vidi; Merc. 924, *quia scortum adduxerit*, *dum ruri ipsa abest*; Most. 1017, *mecum ut ille hic gesserit*, *dum tu abes*, negoti; Hec. 803, *dum sedeo*, *ut quisque venerat*, accedebam; 829, *dicit se anulum*, *dum luctat*, detraxisse; Enn. Ann. 248, *dum transit* striderat hasta.

e) The *dum*-clause refers to the future (13): Asin. 914, *ut decumbamus suadebo*, *hi dum litigant*; Amph. 980, *volo deludi illum dum mihi morigero*; Aul. 621, *perscrutabor fanum*, *dum hic occupatus est*; Cas. 798; Curc. 466, *dum hic egreditur*, commostrabo; Men. 330; Merc. 553; 1005, *non utibilest hic locus*, *dum memoramus*, arbitri ut sint; M. G. 595, *ne, dum apsum*, fuant; Most. 216, *si inservibis*, *dum tibist haec aetatula*; Eun. 595, *sic facito*, *dum lavamus*; Hec. 725, *vin adesse me una dum istam convenis?* Ad. 312, *ut hanc iram in eos evomam*, *dum aegritudo haec est recens*.

2. **With the imperfect indicative:** only Eun. 728, *dum accubabam*,¹ *quam videbar mihi pulchre esse sobrius!*

3. **With the future indicative** (4): Amph. 95, *animum advortite*, *dum argumentum eloquar*; Men. 214, *dum coquetur*, interim potabimus; Truec. 737, *quid erit magistrae*, *dum tu commentabere?* Cato, Agr. 144, 5.

4. **With the perfect indicative** (6): Amph. 599, *omne, uti quicque*

¹ Schmalz, Arch. f. lat. Lex. xi, 338, takes this as illustrating the use of *dum*, 'as long as.' This may be right.

actumst, dum apud hostis sedimus, edissertavit; Capt. 925, quae, dum hic fui, sustentabam; M. G. 504, quod confregisti imbricis, dum sectatu's simiam; Stich. 628, dum parasitus fuisti, rem confregimus; Truc. 380, tempestas quondam, dum vixi, fuit; Turp. 172, dum ego conixi somno, hic sibi prospexit vigilans virginem.

B. *Dum*, 'as long as.'¹

1. With the present indicative (14).

a) The *dum*-clause is achronistic (9): Capt. 83, victitant suo suco dum ruri rurant homines quos ligurriant; 233, dum impetrant, boni sunt; Men. 193, meretrix tantisper blanditur, dum videt; Trin. 309, dum vivit, victor cluet; Truc. 164, dum vivit, hominem noveris; 322, dum vivont, lavant; Eun. 934, dum foris sunt, nil videtur mundius; Ad. 70, dum credit, tantisper pavet; Acc. 344, oblectat spes, dum censet.

b) The *dum*-clause refers to the future (5): Men. 72, haec urbs Epidamnus est dum haec agitur fabula; Truc. 11, Athenis hoc est proscaenium tantisper dum transigimus hanc comediam; Enn. Ann. 331, dum quidem unus homo Romanus superescit; 379, unus dum quit surum ferre tamen, defendere possunt; Cato, (Jord.), p. 38, 11, bene factum, dum vivitis, non abscedet.

2. With the imperfect indicative: Truc. 165, dum vivebas, noveram; And. 53, qui scire posses, dum aetas metus magister prohibebant?

3. With the future indicative (15): Asin. 463, credam fore, dum quidem habebō; Bacch. 225, nec quoquam supplico, dum hoc valebit pectus; 443, noster esto, dum te poteris defensare; Men. 93, facile adservabis, dum eo vincolo vincies; M. G. 50, dum tale facies, adsiduo edes; Pseud. 337; 507; Rud. 557; H. T. 106, te meum dici tantisper volo, dum facies; 136, usque dum ille vitam illam colet, supplicium dabo; 714; Ad. 118, dabitur argentum dum erit commodum; 157; Cato, Agr. 30, usque dum habebis, praebeto; 90; Frag. (Jord.), 42, 1, quid opinamini animi habituros, dum vivent? (Jord. *viverent*).

4. With the perfect indicative (15): Epid. 178, Hercules fui, dum

¹ The *dum*-clauses brought under this head indicate that the time of the subordinate clause is co-extensive with that of the main clause. This notion is often further emphasized by the addition of *tantisper*, *usque*, or some other similar word. English 'while' is sometimes used in translating these.

illa mecum fuit; Merc. 387, perpetuo recte (sc. valui) dum illic fui; M. G. 1220, cum ipso sum locuta, dum lubitum est; Most. 133, usque probus fui, in fabrorum potestate dum fui; Pseud. 256; dedi dum fuit; so Truc. 217; 393, me habebat, dum hic fuit; And. 188, dum tempus tulit, sivi; 443; 832; H. T. 987, dum fuisti solus, tibi dabant; Hec. 459; 461; 594; 837.

C. *Dum*, 'until.'

It is often difficult to determine whether *dum* has the meaning 'until,' or 'as long as.' Thus in a sentence like Bacch. 737, which I take as meaning, 'Wait till he writes,' others (e.g. Schmalz, Archiv, xi, p. 338) interpret 'Wait while he is writing.' It is possible to put a similar interpretation on a large number of the examples I have brought under this head. The particles *usque* and *tantisper* are frequently used to emphasize the force of *dum*.

1. **With the present indicative, which, of course, has future force** (43), e.g. Asin. 327, mansero usque dum peris; Bacch. 737, mane dum scribit; 988, ades dum has pellego; 1005, ausculta dum perlego; Cas. 879, operam date, dum mea facta itero; Cure. 241, perdura dum intestina exputescunt; 253; 280, date viam, dum officium facio; Epid. 633, opperire dum ecfero argentum; Merc. 656, quanto satius est ibi vivere adeo dum te amor missum facit; M. G. 232; 582, me occultabo dum haec consilescent turbae; 1333; 1404; Most. 99; 683; 687, huc concessero dum convoco; Rud. 774, (oro) ut illas serves, dum ego erum adduco; 938, mane dum hanc rudentem complico; 1036, remitte restem dum concedo et consulo; And. 329, profer dum proficiscor aliquo; 714, dum exeo, parumper opperire; H. T. 717, unus est dies dum argentum eripio; 833; Eun. 206, expectabo dum venit; Phor. 512, ut me maneant dum id argentum aufero; 982, retine dum servos evoco; Ad. 196, delibera dum redeo; Stat. 227, dum abit, huc concessero.

2. **With the future indicative** (5): Amph. 470, illos dementiae complebo adeo usque satietatem dum capiet; Cas. 485, id rus hoc erit tantisper dum faciam nuptias; Phor. 583, tacebit dum intercedit familiaritas; Cato, Agr. 22, 2, armillis ferreis temperato usque dum recte temperabitur. The Casina passage is uncertain. Possibly it illustrates *dum*, 'as long as.'

3. With the future perfect indicative (4): Pers. 52, usque ero domi dum excoxero lenoni malam rem; Cato, Agr. 56, panis pondo v usque adeo dum esse ficos coeperint; 110, facito usque dum odorem malum dempseris; 112, 3, decarpito usque dum impleveris.

Schmalz (Archiv, xi, p. 338) calls attention to the fact that *dum*, 'till,' with the perfect indicative is unknown in Early Latin.

Dum Circumstantial.

The *dum*-clause often denotes an attendant circumstance of the main action, viz. in the following passages: Cas. 566, contrivi diem dum adsto, i.e. 'I have wasted the day standing'; Merc. 346, nec quid consili capere possim . . . dum servi mei perplacet consilium, dum rusum hau placet. Some editors place a strong mark of punctuation after 347 and take *dum . . . dum* as = *nunc . . . nunc*. M. G. 762, procellunt sese in mensa, dum appetunt; Pseud. 685, certa mittimus, dum incerta petimus; Rud. 37, dum alios servat, se impedivit; Trin. 839, quibus aerumnis deluctavi, filio dum divitias quaero; 1149, quid ego ineptus, dum sermonem vereor interrompere, solus sto? And. 822, dum studeo obsequi tibi, paene inlusi vitam filiae; H. T. 16, rumores distulerunt multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit paucas Latinas; Eun. 745, dum tibi sororem studeo reddere, sum multa passus; Phor. 76, fidelis dum sum, scapulas perdidi; Hec. 800, totum desedi diem dum exspecto; Ad. 868, dum studeo ut quam plurimum facerem, contrivi vitam; Turp. 149, rem despoliasti, foede dum in lustris lates; Stat. 108, modo fit obsequens hilarus dum id quod petit potitur; M. G. Arg. Acr. 2.

Sometimes the circumstantial clause develops a decided causal force, viz. Men. 257, geminum dum quaeris, gemes, i.e. 'You will come to grief in consequence of your search'; M. G. 409, dum te fidelem facere ero voluisti, apsumptu's paene; Rud. 514, mendicitatem mi optulisti opera tua dum ausculto; Phor. 767, facimus ut malis expediat esse, dum nimium dici nos bonos studemus; Ad. 899, occidunt me dum nimis sanctas nuptias student facere.

In the following passage the *dum*-clause seems to have adversative force: Cas. 367, dum 'mihi' volui, 'huic' dixi, atque dum cupio—.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *DONEC*, *DONICUM*,
'UNTIL.'¹

1. With the present indicative: only Cist. 582, <non> destiti instare usque adeo donec se adiurat anus mihi monstrare; Merc. 194, neque quisquam conspicatus est, donec subit; Most. 116, neque id faciunt donicum parietes ruont.

2. With the future indicative (4): Liv. And. 20, manens sedeto donicum videbis; Cato, Agr. 43, 2, usque donec trimae erunt, fodere oportet; 106, misceto usque donec ovum natabit; 156, 5, coquito usque donec conmadebit.

3. With the perfect indicative (5): Amph. 597, neque credebam donec Sosia me fecit ut crederem; Truc. 38, rete impedit piscis, usque adeo donicum eduxit foras; And. 660, numquam destitit instare usque adeo donec perpulit; Hec. 125, illud visumst ne utiquam grave, donec iam in ipsis nuptiis postquam videt . . . aegre tulit; Acc. 116, donec tu auxilium, Perseu, tetulisti mihi; Cato, (Jord.), p. 43, 4, qui apud regem fuisti donicum ille tibi interdixit rem capitalem.

4. With the future perfect indicative (21): Aul. 58, aut si respexis donicum te iussero; Bacch. 758, ne quoquam exsurgatis, donec erit signum datum; Capt. 339, ego me amitti, donicum ille redierit, non postulo; Pseud. 1167, hunc faciamus ludos, donicum senserit; Rud. 715, aetatemque ibi te usque habitare, donec totum carcerem contriveris; M. G. 269, ibo odorans donec persecutus volpem ero; Vid. fr. v, neutri reddibo, donicum res diiudicata erit haec; 91, usque donec solvero; Plaut. Frag. 155, inimicus esto donicum revenero; Phor. 419, haud desinam donec perfecero; 590; Ad. 717, domi certum obsidere est usque, donec redierit; Cato, Agr. 67, 2, amurcam commutet usque adeo donec in lacum pervenerit (bis); 76, 4; 86, lacte addat usque adeo donec cremor crassus erit factus; 88, 1; 88, 2; 146, 2 donicum solutum erit, pigneri sunt; 149, 2, donicum satisfecerit, pigneri sunt; 150, 2; 161, 3, usque licebit vellas, donicum in semen videris ire; CIL, i, 198, 65, ad eam diem donec solutum erit.

¹ Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, p. 79 f.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *POSTQUAM*.¹

Besides its usual meaning of 'after,' *postquam* also has the significations: 'now that' and 'since.' Occasionally also *postquam* has causal force.

A. *Postquam*, 'after.'

1. **With the historical present (17),** e.g. Capt. 24, *postquam* belligerant Aetoli, capitur filius; 487, *abeo*, *postquam* video; Cure. 325, *tibi sunt parata postquam* scimus venturum; 683, *postquam* nil fit, clamore hominem posco; Men. 24, *postquam* septuennies sunt, pater oneravit navem; Phor. 632, *postquam* sentio, inquam; Hec. 120; 126, *postquam* videt, ibi demum ita aegre tulit; Ad. 765, *postquam* sum satur, prodeambulare huc lubitumst; Stat. 4, capit consilium, *postquam* sentinat satis; Afran. 207, *postquam* videt, commendat; Enn. Ann. 38, *postquam* consistit fluvius; Cato (Jord.), p. 34, 4, *postquam* praeterimus, classem ventus fert.

2. **With the imperfect indicative:** Most. 647, *postquam* haec aedes ita erant, continuo est alias mercatus; Phor. 569, *postquam* videt, simul autem non manebat aetas virginis meam neclegentiam, aibant.

3. **With the perfect indicative (89),** e.g. Amph. 227, *postquam* id actumst, tubae canunt; 802, quid, *postquam* lavi? Bacch. 170, quam ego biennio *postquam* hinc abii, conspicio lubens; Capt. 19, is *postquam* hunc emit, dedit gnato; Cas. 47, *postquam* ea adolevit, eam hic senex amat; 433, ut sussultabat, *postquam* vicit vilicus; Cist. 176, *postquam* fecit, commigravit; Cure. 336, *postquam* mihi responsumst, *abeo*; Men. 34, *postquam* puerum perdidit, animum despondit; Merc. 198, *postquam* aspexit, rogitare ocepit; 256, *postquam* transégi, atque conspicio; Most. 485, *postquam* rediit, abimus omnes cubitum; Poen. 104, *postquam* eas perdidit, usquequaque quaeritat; Pseud. 1268, hoc modo hunc diem sumpsimus, *postquam* opus meum perpetravi; Stich. 364, *postquam* me misisti, sese sol superabat; Trin. 417, *postquam* comedit rem, post rationem putat; 975, *postquam* ego me aurum ferre dixi, post tu factus Charmides; True. 647, post illuc quam veni, advenit qui debebat; And. 35, *postquam* te emi, ut clemens fuerit servitus scis; H. T. 656, *postquam* aspexi,

¹ Schubert, *Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus*, 1881, p. 2; Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, p. 67 ff.

ilico cognovi; Eun. 137, postquam sensit, fingit causas; Hec. 367, postquam me aspexere, ilico exclamant; 373, postquam intro adveni, extemplo eius morbum cognovi; Acc. 118; Stat. 164, placere ocepit graviter postquam emortuast; Turp. 72, postquam venimus, veneratur deos; Afran. 8; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3, postquam aspexit, ponuntur.

5. **With the pluperfect indicative (3):** And. 177, postquam audierat non datum iri uxorem, numquam verbum fecit; Phor. 908, omnis posthabui res, postquam id vos velle animum advorteram; Stat. 44, si illi, postquam rem paternam amiserant, iactati forent.

6. **With the future perfect:** only Cato, Agr. 65, post diem tertium quam lecta erit, facito; 161, 2, post annum tertium quam severis, incendito.

B. *Postquam*, 'now that.'

In English we seldom employ 'after' in connection with the present and present perfect tenses, but use 'now that' instead. Latin, however, uses *postquam* in such cases, often accompanied by *nunc* in the main clause.

a) **With the present (5):** Bacch. 530, illam me velim convenire, postquam inanis sum; Truc. 344, si mi optigerit hereditas, nunc postquam scio dulce atque amarum quid sit ex pecunia; 919, iamne abis, postquam aurum habes? And. 513; Hec. 680, nunc postquam ademptam hanc tibi causam vides, nactus alteram es.

b) **With the perfect (17):** Aul. 79, nunc defaecato animo egredior domo, postquam perspexi salva esse omnia; 454, temperi, postquam implevisti fissorum caput; Capt. 144, postquam potitust hostium, nunc desidero; Cas. 559, veniat velim, ut eum ludificem vicissim postquam hunc delusi; Pers. 528, postquam recitasti, iam mihi credis? 711, postquam abiit, licet; Pseud. 394, postquam abiit, astas solus; 991, scio iam me recte tibi dedisse, postquam elocutus nomen es; Stich. 108, uxorem quaero, postquam vostra mater mortuast; Trin. 600, ibo, postquam exturbavit hic nos; 998, postquam abiit, loquendi libere videtur tempus; Truc. 640, postquam peperit, animos sustulit; Vid. 62, cur patronum quaeram postquam litem perdidisti? And. 304, postquam adempta spes est, cura confectus stupet; 740, revortor, postquam paravi; Ad. 1; Afran. 16, nunc resipivi, postquam pectus est laetitia onustum.

C. *Postquam*, 'since.'

Postquam, 'since,' occurs:

a) With the present indicative: Epid. 504, *postquam liberast, ubi habitet incerte scio*; Men. 234, *hic annus sextus est, postquam ei rei operam damus*; Most. 925; Truc. 682, *postquam in urbem crebro commeo, dicax sum factus*.

b) With the perfect indicative (15): Amph. 605, *huic homini nescioquid est mali obiectum, postquam a me abiit*; 846, *ita nunc homines inmutantur, postquam peregre advenimus*; Cist. 683, *si nemo praeteriit, postquam abivi*; Men. 400, *neque postquam natus sum, intra portam penetravi pedem*; 684, *postquam illam dudum tibi dedi, nunc redeo*; 1050, *men convenisse te audes dicere, postquam imperavi?* Merc. 12, *biennium iam factumst postquam abii*; Most. 957, *postquam abiit, numquam desitum est potarier*; Pers. 822, *iam diu factum est, postquam bibimus*; Pseud. 1052, *nunc demum mi animus in tuto locost, postquam iste hinc abiit*; Stich. 156, *postquam natus sum, satur numquam fui*; 267, *numquam iussit postquam vir abiit*; Truc. 773, *postquam una cura cor meum movit, timeo ne*; Hec. 394, *postquam ad te venit, mensis agitur hic septimus*; Enn. Ann. 389, *DCC sunt anni postquam condita Roma est*.

In M. G. 124, *postquam occasio est, conqueritur fortunas*; Pseud. 1220, *perdidisti postquam dixisti 'pedes,' postquam* has the force of *simul ac*.

D. *Postquam* causal.

In the following instances the *postquam*-clause has a causal force:

Eun. 84, *tremo horreoque postquam aspexi hanc*; Phor. 1, *postquam poeta vetus poetam non potest retrahere a studio, maledictis detertere parat*. Scherer, *De particula quando*, p. 7, brings other examples under this head, *viz.*: Capt. 487; Curc. 683; Most. 647; Ad. 765; Hec. 187, 680. But it is obviously impossible to determine to what extent either the temporal or causal force predominates in such clauses. All we can say is, that in many cases a more or less pronounced causal force has developed in the *postquam*-clauses.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *PRIUS QUAM* AND *ANTE QUAM*.¹

1. *Prius quam* with the present indicative (42).

a) The *prius quam*-clause is achronistic (6).

1) Referring to a single act (3): Men. 276, *prius ambulans ante ostium quam ego redeo*; Merc. 456, *prius respondes quam rogo*. :: *prius emis quam vendo*.

2) Referring to general truths (3): Bacch. 440, *prius quam septuennis est, paedagogo tabula dirumpit caput*; Capt. 663, *occant prius quam sariunt*; M. G. 709, *prius quam lucet, adsunt*.

b) With the historical present: Cure. 637, *prius quam moritur, mihi dedit*; Poen. 66, *puer septuennis surripitur sexennio prius quidem quam moritur pater*; Eun. 10.

c) Referring to the future (34), e.g. Asin. 232, *est etiam prius quam abis quod volo loqui*; 448, *adeam optimumst prius quam incipit*; 940; Bacch. 382, *prius quam malum istoc addis, certumst dicam patri*; 932; Capt. 831, *aperite, prius quam exitium adfero*; Cure. 210, *tene, prius quam abeo, savium*; 566, *reddin annon virginem, prius quam te huic meae machaerae obicio*? Epid. 615; Men. 920; Merc. 1010, *hanc volo prius rem agi quam refero pedem*; M. G. 1329; 1005; 1339, *te saluto prius quam eo*; 1408; Most. 326, *cave ne prius accumbas quam coimus*; Pers. 140, *numquam prius edes quam adfirmas*; Poen. 789, *quid dubito fugere prius quam trahor*? 1211; 1398, *ut minam reddas prius quam abducere*; Stich. 538; Trin. 198; 983; Truc. 115; And. 311, *omnia experiri certumst prius quam pereo*; 556, *ut ante eamus . . . prius quam scelera redducunt animum ad misericordiam*; H. T. 237; Phor. 719; 897, *conveniundust Phormio, prius quam dilapidat nostras xxx minas*; 1037; Enn. Trag. 315, *auxilium peto prius quam oppeto pestem*; Pacuv. 207, *prius quam intereo spatium danunt*; Acc. 189, *prius quam oculi vescuntur*.

2. With the imperfect indicative: Bacch. 438, *olim prius honorem capiebat suffragio quam desinebat esse dicto oboediens*; Truc. 511, *quid illi exitiost prius quam poterat ire in proelium*?

¹ Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, p. 80; Hullihen, *Antequam* and *Priusquam*. *Ante quam* is exceedingly rare in Early Latin. With the indicative it occurs only Cato, Agr. 161, 2 and Frag. (Jord.), p. 51, 3.

3. With the future indicative (7): Bacch. 100, prius hic adero quam te amare desinam; Pseud. 524, prius quam pugnabo, ego etiam prius dabo aliam pugnam; 885, prius quam dabis, gustato; Stich. 197, auscultabo prius quam conloquar; Cato, Agr. 72, prius quam ages, unguito; 134, 1, prius quam messim facies, porcam fieri oportet; ibid., praefato prius quam immolabis. In a similar passage to this last, and immediately preceding it, we have the subjunctive: *prius quam condas*.

4. With the perfect indicative (30).

a) Present perfect (6): Amph. 513, prius abis quam lectus ubi cubuisti concaluit locus; Merc. 156, prius quam sum elocutus, scis; Poen. 919; Pseud. 817; Trin. 526, vinum, prius quam coctumst, pendet putidum; Hec. 287, omne tempus prius quam id rescitumst lucrost. In the first of these passages the reference is to a single act. The others are general expressions.

b) Historical perfect (22): e.g. Amph. 102, prius quam abiit, gravidam uxorem fecit; Asin. 141, prius quam istam adii atque dedi, vitam oblectabas; Aul. 208, prius quam redii, exanimatus fui; Capt. 537, utinam te di prius perderent quam periisti; Cist. 616, prius hanc compressit quam uxorem duxit; Epid. 628, prius venisset quam tu advenisti; M. G. 119, prius perii quam ad erum veni; Pseud. 53; Trin. 976, prius non eras quam feci mentionem; Hec. 294, prius quam hanc uxorem duxi, habebam alibi animum; Pacuv. 167, prius data est quam dicta aut quam reditumst; Enn. Ann. 156; Lucil. 451; Cato (Jord.), p. 51, 3, ante quam is coepit.

c) The present perfect has the force of a future perfect: Aul. 397, cesso, prius quam perii, currere? Most. 78, facite ut redeat prius quam omnia periire.

5. With the pluperfect: only Amph. 603, prius multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adveneram.

6. With the future perfect (18), e.g. Bacch. 920, non dabo prius quam filium convenero; Epid. 70, patrem prius convenire se non volt quam id argentum dinumeraverit; 122, nisi prius comparassit xl minas quam fuero elocutus; 271; 304, ne abitas prius quam venero; Merc. 496; 862, non concedam prius profecto quam investigavero; M. G. 214; Pers. 219; Poen. 908; Pseud. 1030, metuo ne advenat prius quam hinc abierit; H. T. 584, hic prius se indicarit quam ego argen-

tum effecero; Phor. 1044; Cato, 161, 2, ne ante sarueris quam asparagus natus erit; Pacuv. 325, haud sinam quidquam profari prius quam accepso.

Except in Poen. 908 and Hec. 584, the main clause is negative in all the foregoing examples of the future perfect.

Simul ac, simul, simul ut.

The material under this head is as follows: Liv. And. 21, simul ac lacrimas de ore deterisit; Lucil. 757, continuo, simul ac paulo vehementius aura inflarit, fluctus erexerit extuleritque; Asin. 478, id fiet simul ac conspexero; Phor. 823, hic simul argentum repperit cura sese expedit; Cato, Agr. 48, 2, simul herbae inceperint nasci, eximito; Liv. And. 28, simul advenit, portant ad navis edulia alma; Afran. 5, simul limen intrabo, illi extrabunt ilico; Titin. 50, simul ut crevi (from *cerno*); Enn. Ann. 74, et simul effugit, speres ita funditus nostras; Acc. 448, timida eliminor, simul ac nota vox ad auris accidit. See Jones, Archiv für lat. Lexikog. xiv, p. 92.

CLAUSES OF COMPARISON IN THE INDICATIVE.

Ut-Clauses.¹

Ut-clauses of comparison fall into the following classes:

1. One act or state in its entirety is compared with another, the relation being usually emphasized by the employment of some correlative particle, such as *item*, *ita*, *itidem*, etc., e.g.

a) With correlative *ita*: Rud. 381, ut multi fecit, ita probe curavit; Trin. 668, ita est amor ballista ut iacitur; And. 303, ut animus in spe fuit, ita stupet; Ad. 681, ita velim me ames ut dolet; Cato, Agr. 77, ita uti placenta fit, eadem omnia facito; 151, 3, serito crebrum ita uti linum seri solet.

b) With correlative *item*: Bacch. 963, ut ille se blanditiis exemit, item ego dolis me extuli a periculo; Pseud. 868, faciam te item ut Medea Peliam concoxit; 1019, formido ne malus item erga me sit, ut erga illum fuit; Stich. 462, ut illa vitam repperit, item me spero facturum; Truc. 568, meretricem item esse reor, mare ut est; H. T. 417, item ut filium meum amico video inservire, nos quoque senes est aequom senibus obsequi.

c) With correlative *itidem*: Ampli. 711, salutare me solebas, itidem

¹ Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 57 ff.

ut pudicae solent; Curc. 690; Merc. 826, si itidem plectantur, ut illae exiguntur; Rud. 659, iube oculos elidere, itidem ut sepiis faciunt coqui; Trin. 977, itidem ut charmidatus es, recharmida.

d) With correlative *proinde*: Capt. 314, uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curaverit; Hec. 218, ut domi mihi vos eritis, proinde ego ero fama foris.

e) With correlative *pariter*: Pacuv. 248, pariter te esse erga illum video, ut illum ted erga scio; Amph. 1019, pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt.

f) Without correlative: Bacch. 815, adstas ut praeco praedicat; 1108, pari fortuna, aetate ut sumus, utimur.

2. The *ut*-clause does not institute a formal comparison, but merely serves as an adverbial modifier of the main clause or of some particular word in it. Correlative words, such as *ita*, *item*, *itidem*, are sometimes found in connection with clauses of this class.

a) Without correlative; very frequent.

1) Present tense: Amph. 738, recte dicit ut commemorat; Bacch. 228, faciam ut iubes, and so frequently; Capt. 304, fortuna humana fingit artatque ut lubet; so frequently; Cas. 89, non licere, ut volo, loqui; so often; 405, age ut vis; so frequently: Curc. 235, vivo. : : nempe ut dignus es; Men. 359, fit ut meret; 906, fecit ut mos meretricius est; Merc. 381, haud quicquam inepte feci amantes ut solent; 414, virginem non malam, ut matrem addecet familias; 989, iam ut volt per me sibi habeat; M. G. 1024, age ut tibi maxime concinnumst; 1070, facis ut facere aequom; so often; Poen. 722, esto, ut sinit; Eun. 607, sane hercle, ut dicis; so often; Hec. 603, non tute incommodam rem, ut quaeque est, in animum induces pati? Cato, Agr. 139, uti ius est, precor.

2) Imperfect tense: Merc. 45, vi summa ut quidque poterat rapiebat domum.

3) Future tense: Men. 1152, faciam ut tu voles; Hec. 764, utere ut voles.

4) Perfect tense: Amph. 235, ut voluimus, nostra superat manus; 277, perge ut ocepisti; so often; Bacch. 802, ut accepi, ad te attuli; Bacch. 1095, attondit dolis, ut lubitumst; so often; Men. 364, omne paratumst ut iussisti; II. T. 598, dicam, verum ut aliud ex alio incidit; Amph. 1067, ut iacui exsurgo.

5) Pluperfect tense: Amph. 241, quisque ut steterat, iacet; Asin. 413, cur non venisti ut iusseram? so Cas. 580; Merc. 698; Pseud. 1117; Cas. 897, memora ordine, uti oceperas; similarly Pers. 809; Phor. 814, sic commodius arbitror quam ut coeperas.

6) Future perfect tense: Curc. 707, iam iam faciam ut iusseris; so Asin. 828; Eun. 174; Asin. 377, promitto hostire ut merueris.

b) With correlative *ita*:

1) Present tense: Aul. 298, ita esse ut dicis; so often; Capt. 372, ita fers ut decet; so often; 388, ita facis ut oportet; 414, feci ut commemoras; Cas. 235, nempe ut tu mihi es; M. G. 633, experior ita esse ut praedicas; so often; 775, erus meus ita magnus moechus est ut neminem fuisse aequae credo; Trin. 948, faciam ita ut te velle video; H. T. 490, videre vera atque ita uti res est dicere; 702; Eun. 748, educta ita uti te dignumst.

2) Perfect tense: Amph. 775, itast ut obsignavi; Aul. 65, estne ita ut condidi; Epid. 622, estne ita ut tibi dixi? Men. 1038, salvom tibi ita ut mihi dedisti reddibo; Trin. 857, ut ille me exornavit, ita sum ornatus; Trin. 897, ita ut ocepi dicam; And. 949, ita ut possedi nil mutat; Eun. 18, si perget ita ut instituit; Phor. 169, quod habes, ita ut voluisti, uxorem; 776; Ad. 635, ita ut dixi facite; Cato, Agr. 118, condito ita uti scriptum est; 144, 2.

3) Pluperfect tense: And. 542, ut me adiuves atque ita, ut nuptiae fuerant futurae, fiant.

4) Future perfect tense: XII Tab. 5, uti legassit, ita ius esto; ibid., 6, uti lingua nuncupassit, ita ius esto; Cato, Agr. 49, 2, ita ut fuerit ponito!

c) With other correlatives:

1) *Sic*: Bacch. 468, sic est ut loquor; Cas. 398, utinam tibi sic, uti praedicant, sors deliquerit; And. 554, sic hercle ut dicam tibi; Phor. 479, sic habent principia sese ut dixi.

2) *Tam*: Lucil. 408, iam disrumpetur medius, tam (Quicherat; *iam* codd) ut Marsus colubras disrumpit cantu.

3) *Item*: Cist. 142, sine doloribus item ut aliae pariunt quae malum sibi quaerunt; Merc. 874, si huc item properes ut istuc properas; 3, non item facio ut alios vidi; Cato, Agr. 134, 4, dato item ut prius datum est; (Jord.) 36, 10, item uti maximos tumultus disieci;

Agr. 134, 4, obmoveto item uti prius obmoveris; obmoveris item uti prius feceris.

4) With *itidem*: Bacch. 949, itidem Ulixem audiavi ut ego sum fuisse et audacem et malum; Rud. 1010, adfligam ad terram te itidem ut piscem soleo; H. T. 698, celabitur itidem ut celata adhuc est; Eun. 93, utinam hoc tibi doleret itidem ut mihi dolet; 385, si eas itidem fallam ut ab illis fallimur; Hec. 150, quin integram itidem redam ut accepi a suis.

5) With *proinde*: Amph. 517, sic efflictim amare proinde ut hic te deperit; 558, proinde ut commodumst quicque facias; 757, scio istaec facta proinde ut proloquor; 960, proinde eri ut sint ipse item sit; 973, recte loquere et proinde ut uxorem decet; 981, haec curata sint fac proinde adeo ut velle med intellegis; Frag. ix, nisi hoc factum est proinde ut autumo; Capt. 933, numquam referre gratiam possim proinde ut tu promeritus; Cas. 158, faciam uti proinde ut est dignus vitam colat; Stich. 284, proinde ut decet amat virum suum; 759, proinde ut consuetu's cationem aliquam occupito.

6) With *perinde*: H. T. 195, haec perinde sunt ut illius animust.

7) With *exinde*: And. Alt. Ex. 17, studium exinde ut erit, existimaveris.

8) With *hoc modo, hoc pacto*, etc.: Rud. 1072, hoc modo res gesta est ut dico; 1253, nullus erat illo pacto ut illi iusserant; Men. 985 <eo> exemplo servio tergo ut in rem esse arbitror; Merc. 265, amavi olim, verum ad hoc exemplum nunquam ut nunc insanio.

9) With *pariter*: Aul. 22, filium pariter moratum ut pater fuit; Titin. 79, ne tu istum edepol extulisti pariter ut dignus fuit.

10) *Idem*: Hec. 544, ut te olim ostendisti eadem esse nil cessavisti; Capt. 778, eodem pacto ut servi solent coniciam pallium.

11) With *adaeque*: Cist. 55, neque munda adaeque es ut soles.

12) *Adsimulo ut*: Bacch. 962, id periculum adsimulo, Ulixem ut praedicant esse proditum.

13) Cas. 860, nec fallaciam astutiores ullus fecit poeta atque ut haec est facta.

3. The *ut*-clause stands in appositional relation to the contents of the main clause, which often has *ita, item, itidem*, or some other correlative particle.

a) Without correlative:

1) Present tense: e.g. Bacch. 186, cenam pollicere, ut convenit; 1039, ut opinor, dem; so often; Capt. 25, ut fit in bello, capitur alter filius; so often; 123, avis me ferae consimilem faciam, ut praedicas; so often; Cas. 85, ut suspicor, ultro ibit; so often; Cist. 66, quod neque habeo neque quisquam alia mulier, ut perhibent viri; Cure. 332, noluit frustrarier, ut decet; Merc. 851, apparatus sum, ut videtis.

2) Perfect tense, e.g. Bacch. 390, illum intellego invenisse, ut servos mihi nuntiavit; Cist. 170, ut audistis, dat; 366, errat, ut ego dixi; so often; Men. 1146, numquid me morare quin liber, ut iusti, siem? Merc. 94, mercis omnis, ut volui, vendidi; M. G. 1028, ad eam rem habeo omnem aciem, uti iam demonstravi; 1144, ut ocepistis, date operam adiutabilem; so often; True. 203, ut nuntiatumst, hic adfuturum aiunt eum; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 3, ut dixi, periculosum.

3) With pluperfect tense: Capt. 17, fugitivos ille, ut dixeram ante, quem apstulerat, vendidit; Cure. 636, pater meus mihi dedit, ut aequom fuerat; Pers. 576, adduco, ut dudum dixeram; H. T. 500.

b) With *ita*:

1) Present tense, e.g. Stich. 5, quorum negotiis, ita ut aequom est, sollicitae sumus; 30, hic tertius annus — :: ita ut memoras; And. 80, forte, ita ut fit, filium perduxere illuc; so often; H. T. 296, si haec vera sunt, ita uti credo; Ad. 755, ita uti decet, hilarum fac te; Cato, Agr. 157, 7, si uteris, ita uti moneo.

2) Perfect tense, e.g. Cure. 43, ita ut ocepi dicere, ei ancillula est; so often; Eun. 207, fac, ita ut iussi, deducantur; so often; Phor. 280, ubi non respondeas, ita ut ille fecit; 908, omnis posthabui mihi res, ita ut par fuit; Ad. 894, quoi dominus curaest, ita ut tibi sensi.

3) Pluperfect tense, e.g. Men. 986, ut iusserat, ita venio advorsum; Eun. 869, ut eam non possim suis, ita ut aequom fuerat, tradere; Phor. 651, amici filiam, ita ut aequom fuerat, volui uxorem ducere.

c) With other correlatives, e.g. Capt. 43, reducem faciet imprudens: itidem ut saepe plus insciens quis fecit quam prudens; Amph. 63, faciam sit, proinde ut dixi, tragicomoedia; Cas. 94, conicito possisne praeripere Casinam uxorem, proinde ut postulas; Trin. 659, tibi, proinde ut (ac, *P*) merere, summas habeo gratias.

4. *Ut; ita . . . ut*, equivalent to *qualis; talis . . . qualis*.

a) *Ut* alone, e.g. Liv. And. 27, facit homines ut prius fuerunt; Amph. 430, eam ut matre fuerat natum vini eduxi meram; Bacch. 399, certamen cernitur sisne ut esse oportet; 724, bellus atque, ut esse optabam, locus; Capt. 228, ero ut voles; 236; M. G. 475, palam est eam esse ut dicis.

b) *Ita . . . ut*, e.g. Bacch. 386, quist amicus ita uti nomen possidet; Cist. 47, si, ut dicis, ita futura es; 48, si ita eris ut volo; so often; Men. 981, si ita ut in rem ducunt sint; ibid. ita ero ut me esse oportet; Merc. 428, mandavit ad illam faciem, ita ut illa est; Stich. 112, si sint ita ut censeo; Trin. 311, nimio satiust ut opusted ita esse quam ut animo lubet; 620; 1170, ille ita est ut esse nolo; Hec. 604, si cetera ita sunt ut vis; Ad. 161, sed ita ut usquam fuit fide quisquam optuma; Cato, Agr. 144, 2, scalae ita uti datae erunt, reddito!

5. *Ita . . . ut* in asseverations.

a) *Ut* after optative subjunctives: Bacch. 111, ita me di ament, ut videtur; similarly 892; Cas. 452; Cure. 208; Pseud. 943; Stich. 505; H. T. 686; Hec. 579; Ad. 749; Capt. 623, ita faxit, ut non est; 878, ita me condecoret, ut vidi; Cure. 578, ita me amassint, ut tua verba non pluris facio; H. T. 1030, ita mihi sis superstes, ut ex me natus es; Phor. 807, ita me servet Iuppiter ut propior illi nemost.

b) *Ut* after future indicatives expressing a wish: Aul. 761, ita te amabit ut nescis; similarly Merc. 762; H. T. 463; 749.

c) *Ut* after future indicative expressing a mild command or request: Amph. 1, 4, 8, 13, ut voltis, ita huic facietis fabulae silentium.

d) *Ut* alone without correlative *ita* occurs in Amph. 831, per supremi regis regnum iuro, ut nemo corpus contigit.

6. The *ut*-clause indicates proportion, e.g. Naev. Trag. 8, ut quisque est meritis, pretium ferat; Trin. 1173, miserumst male promerita ut merita sunt si ulcisci non licet; Afran. 26, sumpsi non ab illo modo sed ut quisque habuit; Hec. 380, omnibus nobis ut res dant sese, ita magni sumus; Turp. 142, ut quisque minimo contentus fuit, ita fortunatam vitam vixit maxime; Pseud. 679, proinde ut quisque fortuna utitur ita praecellit; Trin. 65, proinde ut bene vivitur, diu vivitur; Stich. 520, ut quoique res paratast, perinde amicis utitur.

7. The *ut*-clause indicates the standard or norm according to which the content of the main clause has validity, e.g. Bacch. 218, ut hanc

rem natam intellego, quod ames paratumst; Capt. 596, pol ego ut rem video, tu inventus es vera vanitudine qui convincas; 921, ut adornat, iam nihil est ('at the rate he is making provision'); 990, ipsust Tyndarus tuos filius, ut quidem hic argumenta loquitur; Cas. 312, salva spes est, ut verba audio; Cist. 5, ut meus est animus, fieri non posse arbitror; 194, ut sunt humana, nihil est perpetuom datum; 717, hanc scire oportet, signa ut dicit; 756, ea est ut numerus annorum attulit; Cure. 110 a, pol ut praedicas, vindemia haec huic anu non satis est; Men. 206, iv minae perierunt, ut ratio redditur; 861, illum metuo, ut minatur, ne quid male faxit; 1117, vos quot eratis? : : ut nunc memini, duo; 953, quot sunt satis? : : proinde ut insanire video, quattuor, nihilo minus; Merc. 410, ut nunc sunt maledicentes homines, uxori meae mihique obiectent lenocinium facere; Pseud. 596, hi loci sunt, ut ego oculis rationem capio; 784, ut nunc male metuo, videor posse; 979, ut vestitu's, es perfossor parietum; 1076, nullumst periculum stipularier, ut concepisti verba; Rud. 303, ut nunc fluctuat mare, nulla nobis spes est; 901, operam ludos facit, ut tempestas est atque ut noctu fuit; Trin. 547, istest ager, ut te audivi loqui, malos in quem mitti decet; 729, ut rem narras, nullo modo potest fieri; 677; 887, opus factost viatico ad tuom nomen, ut tu praedicas; Truc. 412, nunc ut praemisit nuntium miles, non multo post aderit; 775; And. 77, ita ut ingeniumst omnium ab labore proclive ad lubidinem, accepit condicionem; H. T. 169, ut diei tempus est, tempust monere; so 212; 551, si evenerit, ut sunt humana, ut faciat filius; 649, ut omnes sumus religiosae, de digito anulum detraho; 869, ut istam rem video, istius obsaturabere; 870, hac uti sunt, cautim dabis; Eun. 525, hanc se intendit esse, uti est audacia; Phor. 55, non neclexisse habeo gratiam. : : praesertim ut nunc sunt mores; 638, ut est ille bonus vir, tria non commutabitis verba; 774, haud scio, ut homost, an mutet animum; 820, laetus sum, ut meae res sese habent, fratri obtigisse quod volt; Ad. 389, credo, ut est dementia; 480, hic Geta, ut captus est servorum, non malus; so Afran. 313; Afran. 4, ut tu rem narras, bona comest cotidie.

8. *Ut* causal. In a few instances the *ut*-clause of the type just considered develops further a force which is nearly or quite causal. The beginnings of this usage may be seen in a clause like Phor. 638, cited above under 7, ut est ille bonus vir, tria non commutabitis

verba. Examples of the causal value are: Amph. 329, lassus sum hercle, navi (*e navi*, codd) ut vectus huc sum; Bacch. 106, nam uti navi vecta's, credo timida's; Merc. 371, per mare ut vectu's, nunc oculi terram mirantur; Most. 268, ut speculum tenuisti, metuo ne olant argentum manus; Pseud. 278, in pauca, ut occupatus nunc sum, confer; 661, ut lassus veni de via, me volo curare; Truc. 576, pallida est, ut peperit puerum; Ad. 647, habitant hic quaedam mulieres pauperulae, ut opinor eas non nosse te; Afran. 72, post narravero, nunc est distentus animus ut negotiis.

9. *Ut = quanto*: Most. 831, ut quidquid magis contemplo, tanto magis placet.

10. Isolated is Asin. 576, num male relatast gratia ut collegam collaudavi, where the *ut*-clause is explanatory of *gratia*.

11. *Utquomque*: Amph. 343; Epid. 49, utquomque ventust, exim velum vortitur; so Poen. 754.

Sicut-Clauses.

Sicut with the indicative occurs in the following classes of clauses:

1. One act or state is compared in its entirety with another: Capt. 934, et poteris et ego potero, sicut tu huic potes facere merito maxime; M. G. 727, sicut merci pretium statuit probus agoranomus, itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit; Trin. 547, istest ager in quem omnis malos mitti decet, sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas quo cuncti qui aetatem egerint caste convenient; Acc. 403, sicut perfremunt delphini, item ad auris cantum refert.

2. The *sicut*-clause does not institute a formal comparison, but merely serves as an adverbial modifier of the main clause or of some particular word in it: Aul. 294, nempe sicut dicis; Bacch. 718, sicut dicis; Most. 771, haec sunt sicut praedico; Trin. 685, sicut dixi faciam.

3. The *sicut*-clause stands in appositional relation to the contents of the main clause: Bacch. 712, geritote amicis vestris aurum corbibus, sicut animus sperat; 1084a, viso ecquid eum ad virtutem opera sua compulerit, sicut scio fecisse; Capt. 696, si rebitet, sicut confido fore; Rud. 1111, quibuscum periit, sicuti dixi; Trin. 805, set clanculum, sicut praecepi; Cato, Agr. 141, 3, harum rerum ergo, sicuti dixi, macte esto.

4. *Sicut*, 'as for example': Bacch. 548, se quom frustrant, frus-

trari alios stolidi existumant; sicut est hic; Capt. 498, quid est suavius quam bene rem gerere bono publico, sicut ego feci? Cas. 563, stultitia magna est ad forum procedere; sicut ego feci; Men. 585, eis ubi dicitur dies, simul patronis dicitur; sicut me sollicitum cliens quidam habuit; M. G. 514, ita sum coactus ut nesciam utrum me expostulare tecum aequiust,—... sicut etiam nunc nescio; Most. 381, miserum est igitur demum fodere puteum ubi sitis faucis tenet; sicut ego nunc quaero; 412, id viri doctist opus, tranquille cuncta ut proveniant; sicut ego efficiam; Poen. 504, tardo amico nihil est nequius, praesertim homini amanti... sicut ego hos duco advocatos; 1192a, ut volup est homini, si quod agit cluet victoria; sicut nos inter alias praestitimus pulchritudine.

5. *Sicut = qualis*: Most. 544, nihil est miserius quam animus conscius, sicut me habet.

6. *Sicut* with causal, or partly causal force: Epid. 271, nunc occasiost faciundi prius quam advenerit, sicut cras hic aderit; 544, sin est homo, sicut anni multi dubiam dant; M. G. 974, illam iube adire, sicut soror venit; Pers. 135, alium adlegavero qui esse se peregrinum praedicet, sicut istic leno non vi menses Megaribus huc est quom commigravit; Pseud. 373, nisi attulerit miles v minas, sicut haec est praestituta summa ei argento dies, posse opinor facere me officium meum.

7. In asseverations: Asin. 16, sicut tuom vis unicum gnatum tuae superesse vitae, ita ted optestor per senectutem tuam.

Velut-Clauses.

1. *Velut*, 'just as': Enn. Ann. 304, concurrunt veluti venti; Lucil. 245, veluti videmus, sic est; 812, velut auceps ille facit.

2. *Velut*, 'as for example': Aul. 460, facinus audax incipit qui cum opulento pauper homine rem habere; veluti Megadorus temptat me omnibus modis; Curc. 681, non male creditur qui numquam reddunt, sed prosum perit; velut x minas dum solvit omnis mensas transiit; Merc. 225, di hominibus miris exemplis somnia in somnis danunt, velut ego in somnis egi; so also Rud. 593; Most. 705, omnibus ire dormitum odio est, velut nunc mihi certa res est ut abeam potius quam domi cubem; Pseud. 767, quoi servitutem di danunt lenoniam puero, ne illi malam rem magnam danunt; velut haec mi

evenit servitus; Truc. 244, datores novos oportet quaerere, velut hic agrestis est adulescens, probus dator; 571, des quantumvis, nusquam apparet; velut haec meretrix meum erum intulit in pauperiem; Pacuv. 374, id magis veri simile esse usus edocet; velut Orestes modo fuit rex, factust mendicus modo.

3. *Consimilis velut* : Poen. 824, quoi homini erus est consimilis velut ego habeo nunc.

Praeut.

Examples: Amph. 374, perii. : : parum etiam, praeut futurumst, praedicas; Bacch. 929, non pedibus termento fuit praeut erum expugnabo; Men. 935, Nestor nunc est, praeut dudum fuit; Merc. 470, nugas maxumas fuisse credo, praeut quo pacto ego divorsus distrahor; M. G. 19, nihil hoc quidemst praeut alia dicam; Eun. 301, ludum dicet fuisse illum, praeut huius rabies quae dabit.

Quasi = Sicut.

Quasi seems to be used only to introduce clauses in formal comparisons, where the content of one clause is likened to that of another: Aul. 595, quasi pueri qui nare discunt scirpea induitur ratis, eodem modo servom ratem esse ero aequom censeo; Capt. 80, quasi coeleae latent, item parasiti latent; 1002, quasi pueris monedulae dantur, itidem mi haec upupa datast; Merc. 695, coquos, quasi solet hortator remiges hortarier, ita hortabatur; Rud. 1008, te, itidem quasi peniculus novos exurgeri solet, exurgebo; Pseud. 199, quasi Dircam olim devinxere ad taurum, item te distringam ad carnarium; 401, quasi poeta quaerit, reperit, facit, poeta fiam; 955, ut transvorsus cedit, quasi cancer solet; Stich. 539, ei filiae duae erant, quasi nunc meae sunt; ibid. fuit, quasi ego sum, senex; 540, erant duobus nuptae fratribus, quasi nunc meae sunt vobis; 543, caeleps erat, quasi ego nunc sum; 545, senex dixit, quasi ego nunc tibi dico; 549, quis istuc dicit? an ille quasi tu? : : quasi ego nunc dico; Plaut. Frag. 79, agite nunc, quasi solent triarii; Com. Frag. p. 144, Ribb., quasi messor unum quemque spicum collegit.

Quam-Clauses.¹

1. *Tam . . . quam.*

a) With adjectives or adverbs: Bacch. 767, tam frictum illum reddam quam frictum est cicer; Capt. 475, tam aperto capite ad

¹ Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 62 ff.

lenones eunt quam fontes condemnant; 639, tam satis quam numquam hoc invenies secus; Cas. 759, nec credo usquam ludos tam festivos fieri quam hic fiunt ludi seni nostro; Men. 1063, tam consimilest quam potest; Merc. 186, tam certe quam ego te aut tu me vides; 956, tam propitiam reddam quam quom propitiast Iuno Iovi; M. G. 240, tam simile quam lacte lactist; 457, tam east quam potis nostra erilis concubina; Most. 44, neque tam facetis quam tu vivis victibus; 559, tam facile vinces quam pirum volpes comest; 751, tam liquidust quam liquida esse tempestas solet; Poen. 355, tam tranquillum quam mare olimst; Stich. 454, tam confido quam potis; Trin. 541, oves tam glabrae quam haec est manus; 574, numquam tam exspectatus filius natus quam illuc est 'spondeo' natum mihi; Ad. 849, tam excoctam reddam quam carbost; Eun. 211, utinam tam aliquid invenire facile possis quam hoc peribit.

b) *Tam* . . . *quam* alone: Capt. 312, tam ille apud nos servit quam ego apud te servio; Ad. 278, non tam quidem quam vis.

2. *Ita* . . . *quam*: Cure. 326, ita me amabit quam ego amo.

3. *Aequae* . . . *quam*: Epid. 306, nullum esse opinor agrum aequae feracem quam est noster Periphanes; M. G. 465, qui aequae faciat confidenter quicquam quam mulier facit; Stich. 274, numquam aequae patri suo nuntium lepidum attulit quam ego nunc meae erae nuntiabo.

4. *Quam* alone without correlative: Capt. 421, hau centensumam partem laudat quam meritust; Rud. 943, non pisces expeto quam tui sermonis sum indigens; Stich. 721, quam vis desubito vel cadus vorti potest.

5. Peculiar is Truc. 324, si proinde amentur, mulieres diu quam lavant, omnes amantes balneatores sient.

6. After comparatives:

a) No correlative: Merc. 232, posterius quam mercatus fueram, visus sum in custodelam concredere; Asin. 63, posterius dieis quam credo tibi; Bacch. 630a, mortuos pluris pretist quam ego sum; so also with *plus*: Cas. 243; 356; Cist. 122; Epid. 66; Men. 592; Merc. 491; M. G. 651; Rud. 453; 504; Trin. 51; Truc. 64; 296; 374; 755; H. T. 659, plus spei video quam volo; Phor. 584; Acc. 157, vereor plus quam fas est; 152; Capt. 118, omnes liberi lubentius sumus quam servimus; so also with *lubentius*: Epid. 380; Men. 979; Capt. 425, non magis quam experiar persequi; so also with *magis*:

Curc. 305; Cist. 654; Merc. 619; M. G. 615; 1086; Pers. 305; Poen. 1194; Stich. 8a; Truc. 720; Acc. 355, te conmiserebam magis quam miserebar mei; Capt. 430, minus dixi quam volui; so also with *minus*: Merc. 424; Pseud. 956; Stich. 498; Truc. 322; 452; 673; Eun. 1027, qui minus quam Hercules servivit Omphalae? Phor. 11; 787; Cas. 1008, lepidiorem uxorem nemo quam ego habeo hanc habet; Cist. 533, perdam operam potius quam carebo; Most. 229, venibit potius quam sinam egere; Curc. 256, meliorem quam ego sum suppono tibi; so also with *melior, melius*: Most. 695; Stich. 157; Ad. 295, melius fieri haud potuit quam factumst; Afran. 3, omnem melius rem callere quam volo; Curc. 593, mulierem peiorem quam haec est; so also with *peior, peius*: Most. 709; Pers. 153; Poen. 825; Pseud. 1017; Stich. 109; 125; Men. 1089, similium quam hic tui est; so also M. G. 551; M. G. 22, gloriarum plenior quam illic est; so also 513; M. G. 1, curate ut splendor sit clarior quam solis radii esse solent; 664, leniorem dices quam mutum est mare liquidusculusque ero quam ventus est; Most. 532, scelestiorem annum numquam ullum vidi quam hic annus obtigit; 824, multum improbiore sunt quam credidi; Pers. 442, citius abeunt quam in cursu rotula circumvortitur; Poen. 507, tardiores quam corbitae sunt; 586, doctiores sunt quam hi sunt; 694, curer mollius quam oculi curari solent; Pseud. 670, non potuit mi opportunius advenire quam haec allatast mi epistula; Rud. 20, maiore multa multat quam litem auferunt; Stich. 343, nullum nequiorem quam hic est; Trin. 459, benigniorem quam nunc experior esse confido fore; Truc. 627, machaeram longiorem habes quam haec est; 635, quo pacto excludi potui planius quam exclusus nunc sum? H. T. 681, ut frugalior sim quam volt; Eun. 527, Thais quam ego sum maiusculast; Phor. 349, enumquam contumeliosius quam haec est (facta) mihi? 438, si attigeris secus quam dignumst; 808, ut propior illi quam ego sum, nemost; Ad. 211, numquam vidi iniquius certationem comparatam quam haec fuit; 834, attentiores sumus quam sat est; Plaut. Frag. 43, nil feci secus quam me decet.

b) With correlatives:

1) Type *quam magis . . . tam magis*: Poen. 348, quam magis aspecto, tam magis est nimbat; Bacch. 1091, magis quam reputo, tam magis uror.

2) Type *quam magis . . . magis*: Bacch. 1076, *quam magis foveo, magis curaest*; Trin. 861, *quam magis specto, minus placet*.

3) Type *quam magis . . . tam*: Asin. 158, *quam magis te capessis, tam aestus te refert*.

7. After words implying a comparative: Merc. 297, *bis tanto valeo quam valui*; M. G. 1082, *postriduo natus sum quam Iuppiter natust*; si hic pridie natus foret *quam illest*; Cato, Agr. 113, 1, *hoc facito pridie quam voles*; Pseud. 1239, *alio pacto quam fit*; Pers. 366, *quae praeter sapiet quam placet parentibus*; Rud. 587, *quam potavi praeter animi quam lubuit sententiam*; Merc. 23, *nec quisquam sine grandi malo prae quam res patitur studuit elegantiae*; Most. 981, *nihil hoc quidem est prae quam alios sumptus facit*; H. T. 59, *mihi videre praeter aetatem tuam facere et praeter quam res te adhortatur tua*; Cato (Jord.), 8, 17, *ea (fana) exauguravit praeterquam, quod Termino fanum erat, id nequitum exugurari*; CIL, i, 196, 24, *quei arvorum ead fecisent quam suprad scriptum est*.

8. With superlatives:

a) Type *quam plurimum potest*: Cato, Agr. 157, 15, *subducito quam plurimum poteris*; Truc. 847, *uxorem quam primum potest, abduce*; Men. 834, *concede quam potest longissime*; Capt. 398, *ut remittat : : . . . : at quam primum pote*.

b) Type *quam maxime est . . . tam facillime*: H. T. 997, *quam maxime huic vana haec suspicio erit, tam facillume pacem conficiet*; Ad. 501, *quam vos facillume agitis, tam maxime oportet*; Cato, Agr. 64, 2, *quam citissime conficies, tam maxime expediet*; *ibid.* *quam diutissime in amurea erit, tam deterrimum erit*; 65, 1, *quam acerbissima olea oleum facies, tam oleum optimum erit*; 157, 8, *quam plurimum ederit, tam citissime sanus fiet*; Frag. (Jord.) 85, 9, *veternosus quam plurimum bibit, tam maxime sitit*.

c) Type *quam citissime potest . . . tam*: Capt. 352, *quam citissime potest, tam hoc cedere ad factum volo*.

d) Type *quam restito . . . tam maxime*: Merc. 122, *quam restito, tam maxime res in periculo vortitur*; M. G. 781, *quam potis tam verba confer maxime ad compendium!*

9. *Quam si, quasi*: CIL, i, 196, 29, *extrad quam sei quid ibei sacri est*; so i, 198, 72; Cato, Agr. 144, 4, *ne quis concedat extra quam si quem socium dixerit*; Enn. Trag. 184, *otio qui nescit uti, plus negoti*

habet quam quom est negotium in negotio; Poen. 240, cogita item nos perhiberi quam si salsa muriatica esse autumantur; Pseud. 641, magis erit solutum quasi ipsi dederis. In Merc. 1023, Seyffert's conjecture *quasi* for *si* is usually read: plus perdet quasi praehibuerit palam.

10. *Tamquam* = *sicut*: Eun. 263, si potis est, tamquam philosophorum habent disciplinae ex ipsis vocabula, parasiti ita ut Gnathonici vocentur.

Clauses Introduced by Atque, 'as,' 'than.'

1. *Proinde ac*: Amph. 583, te ego faciam proinde ac meritis es.

2. *Pariter ac*: Phor. 786, pariter nunc opera me adiuves ac re dudum opitulata es.

3. *Talis ac*: Phor. 1028, faxo tali sit mactatus atque hic est infortunio.

4. *Aequae, adaequae ac*: Aul. 297, pumex non aequae est arduus atque hic est senex; Cas. 128, numquam ieiunium ieiunumst aequae atque te reddibo; Phor. 581, te mihi fidelem esse aequae atque egomet sum mihi scibam.

5. *Similis atque*: Phor. 31, ne simili utamur fortuna atque usi sumus.

6. *Without correlative*: Bacch. 549, sicut est hic quem esse amicum ratus sum atque ipse sum mihi; M. G. 164, haud centensumam partem dixi atque possum.

7. *With comparatives*: Merc. 897, amicior mihi nullus vivit atque is est.

8. *With alius, aliter, etc.*: Pseud. 474, alio modo atque te soleo; H. T. 264, aliter tuum amorem atque est accipis; Eun. 82, neve aliorum atque ego feci acceperit; Phor. 530, nilo sum aliter ac fui; Phor. 684, aliud mihi respondes ac rogo; Hec. 365, alio suspicans morbo me visurum adfectam ac sensi; 375, nec voce alia ac res mornebat ipsa poterat conqueri; Ad. 597, numquam te aliter atque esse animum induxi.

9. *Atque uti*: Amph. 274, neque se luna mutat atque uti exortast semel; cf. 1019, pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt.

INDICATIVE IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS.¹

The use of the indicative in indirect questions was earlier than the employment of the subjunctive in such clauses, and originated in such paratactic expressions as *Cure. 166, eloquere! quid est? Bacch. 816, responde! quis me vendit? 749, obsecro, quid usust?* In many instances it is obviously impossible to determine whether the question is dependent or independent. Similarly in expressions like: *eloquar ut factumst*, we may have either an indirect question, or a dependent relative clause,—either, ‘I will tell you how it happened,’ or ‘I will recount it to you as it happened.’ But quite apart from such ambiguities as those alluded to, we have a large number of clear cases of indirect questions in the indicative. Like indirect questions in the subjunctive, these fall into pronominal questions and sentence questions. In a few instances we have indicative indirect questions which are deliberative.

PRONOMINAL QUESTIONS.

Like indirect questions in the subjunctive, these pronominal questions in the indicative are introduced by various interrogative pronouns and adverbs. Thus:

1. **Introduced by *quis*** (87), e.g. *Amph. 17, quois iussu venio dicam; Bacch. 473, omnem rem scio quem ad modumst; 861, audin quae loquitur? Capt. 206a, scimus nos nostrum officium quod est; 207, sentio quam rem agitis; 592, audin quid ait? Cist. 82, qua accersitae caussa estis eloquar; Men. 349, videamus qui egreditur; 425, scin quid te amabo ut facias? 472, opserva quid dabo; Merc. 431, nescis quid dicturus sum; 783, dicam id quid est; M. G. 377, mirumst facinus quo modo transire potuit; Most. 505, quae monstra fiunt vix possum eloqui; 1039, narravero quibus exemplis med ludificatus est; Pers. 291, spectra quid dederō; 638, quaeras qui fuit; Poen. 1185, ingeniis quibus sumus gnosco; Pseud. 18, fac me certum quid tibi est; 261, nosce hunc quis est; Rud. 355, non audivisti quo pacto voluit? 592, lenonem quid agit visam; 946, quin loquere quid vis? 1102, expedi quid postulas; Stich. 410, videto quid potest pecunia; H. T.*

¹ Becker, *De Syntaxi interrogationum obliquarum apud priscos Scriptores Latinos*, Studemund's Studien, i, p. 115 ff. For a radical view of these clauses, see Gaffiot, *Le Vrai Latin* (1908). G. takes *quid* as a relative!

494, scin quid volo? 600, vide quod inceptat facinus; 649, qua hoc oceptumst causa, loquere; Eun. 99, qua gratia iussi auscultā; 338, scin quid volebam; 1037, audin hic quid ait? Hec. 405, quae futurast vita quom in mentem venit; Stat. 216, vide quid fert morum similitas.

At times we find the indicative and subjunctive combined in coördinate clauses, e.g. Cist. 56, eloquere et quid est et quid velis; Most. 199, vides quae sim et quae ante fui; Pers. 514, nescis quid te instet boni, neque quam tibi Fortuna faculam adlucere volt; And. 649, nescis quantis in malis vorser quantasque hic conflavit sollicitudines; Amph. 17.

2. Introduced by *ut* (51) especially after *vide, viden, etc.*, e.g. Asin. 598, audin ut largus est? Bacch. 202, scis ut confringi solet; 492, viden ut aegre patitur? 1130; Curc. 93; Curc. 126, vide ut ingurgitat; 153, hoc vide ut dormiunt; 311, viden ut expalluit; Men. 808, scibo ex hoc ut factumst; 919, audin ut deliramenta loquitur? Merc. 481, satin ut oblitus fui? M. G. 1289, mitto iam ut occidi Achilles civis passus est; Most. 811, non tu vides hunc voltu uti tristi est? Pseud. 1312, ut quidque egisti scio; Rud. 1211, eloquere ut haec res optigit; Trin. 749, edoceam ut res se habet; Truc. 851, ut factumst fecit omnem rem palam; And. Alt. Ex. 14, me repperisse ut habitus fui; Eun. 670, illud vide os ut sibi distorsit; Ad. 228, illud vide ut oppresit; 513, ut res gestast narrabo; 559; Acc. 303, viden ut te inpietas stimulat? Turp. 103, viden ut fastidit mei? 104, viden ut osculatur?

3. Introduced by *quam* (19), e.g. Amph. 360, vide quam mox vapulare vis; 507, observatote quam blande mulieri palpabitur; Capt. 557, viden quam inimico voltu intuitur; M. G. 64: Most. 458, non potest dici quam indignum facinus fecisti; 829, specta quam arte dormiunt; Pers. 139, scin quam potest? Stich. 702, in mentem venit quam cynice accipimur; H. T. 638, quam bene prospectumst cogita; Hec. 90, non dici potest quam cupida eram huc redeundi; 223; 417; 471, idque si nunc memorare velim quam fideli animo fui; 646, nequeo quam videtur factum prave proloqui; 683.

4. Introduced by *ubi* (3): Aul. 63, ne persentiscat ubist apsconditum; Bacch. 203, dic ubi ea nunc est; Hec. 84, dic mihi ubi te oblectasti.

5. Introduced by *quantus* (9), e.g. Bacch. 663, lubet scire quantum

erus sibi dempsit; M. G. 1074, non scis quantum honorem debeo; Pseud. 1184, commemora quanti conductast; Phor. 247, incredibile quantum erum ante eo sapientia; 986, vide quantum valet; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 23, 13, cogitate quanto cautius facimus.

6. Introduced by *quo* (3): Stich. 541, miror quo evasurust apologus; Trin. 938, lubet experiri quo evasurust; Eun. 237, em quo redactus sum.

7. Introduced by *qui*: only Phor. 398, cedo qui est cognata. Pseud. 866, qui possum? doce, is probably not dependent.

8. Introduced by *unde*: Amph. 424, nescio unde haec huc spectavit; Cist. 748, eloquere unde haec sunt.

9. Introduced by *uter*: Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam; Ad. 195, nunc vide utrum vis.

10. Introduced by *cur*: only Poen. 353 (rogasne), cur iratus est?

11. Introduced by *quam ob rem* (3): Rud. 427, quam ob rem sum missa tu mi aias; And. Alt. Ex. 6, quam ob rem non volui eloquar; Phor. 798, eequid locutu's cum istac quam ob rem hanc ducimus?

12. Introduced by *quapropter*: only Men. 714, non tu scis quapropter canem esse praedicabant?

13. Introduced by *qua*: only Most. 969, scio qua me ire oportet.

14. Introduced by *si* (23), e.g. Amph. 772, illud miror si habet pateram; Aul. 620, perscrutabor fanum, si inveniam; Bacch. 529, ibo ut visam ad eum si forttest domi; Cas. 591, viso huc amator si rediit; Cist. 651, sciat si possum; Cure. 701, animum advortite si possum; Men. 142; 1048, ibo intro si possum exorare; Poen. 1064, memoradum; si novi forte aut si sunt cognati; Trin. 763, vide consilium si placet; Trin. 921; Eun. 545, idque adeo visam si domist; 838; Phor. 553, vide si quid potes; 674, me certiozem face si illam dant; Ad. 154, volo scire si apud forum est; 239, vide si satis placet.

SENTENCE QUESTIONS.

Dependent sentence questions in the indicative are rare in Early Latin. I have noted only the following instances: Aul. 65, ibo ut visam estne ita ut condidi; M. G. 514, ita sum coactus ut nesciam utrum aequiust; Pseud. 935, viden satin condecet; Rud. 948, vide num quispiam consequitur; And. 878, vide num eius color pudoris signum

indicat; Turp. 129, hoc quaero, ignoscere istic solentne; 171; die mihi an oblita, obsecro, es eius crebras mansiones.

DEPENDENT DELIBERATIVE QUESTIONS.

Dependent deliberative questions in the subjunctive may be either pronominal or sentence questions. The few instances of dependent deliberatives in the indicative are all pronominal. I have noted only Stich. 706, vide quot cyathos bibimus; Acc. 191, dubito quid agis; Epid. 274, quin tu eloquere quid faciemus.

CAUSAL CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *Quod*.¹

1. Adverbial clauses (36).

a) *Quod* alone (27), Bacch. 523, neu ei suscenseat quod eum ludificatus est; Capt. 349, meo periculo experiar fidem quod me esse scit benivolum; Epid. 630, si remoratus es quod ista voluit; M. G. 502, nisi supplicium datur quod meas confregisti imbrices, quod inspectavisti, quod tractavisti; 1412, iura te non nociturum nemini quod hic verberatu's aut quod verberabere (in 1414 we have the subjunctive in a similar expression: me nociturum nemini quod vapularim); H. T. 58, facit ut te moneam quod mihi videre praeter aetatem tuam facere; 132, aut etiam amplius quod illa aetas magis idoneast; 888, quod se adsimulat, id dicis? 1017, quid metuis ne non convincas esse illum tuom? :: quod filia'st inventa? Eun. 434, purgon ego me de istac Thaidi quod eam me amare suspicatast? Hec. 368, laetae exclamant 'venit,' id quod me repente adspexerant; Ad. 809, tu illos duo olim pro re tollebas tua quod satis putabas tua bona fore; Naev. Com. 32, asseri laudes ago, quom votis me multat meis, quod audibam; Cato (Jord.), 19, 11, atque quod sanguen defluserat cognovere; 48, 1, quod tu sacra stata, sollemnia capite sancta deseruisti; 85, 6, quod iter longius arduiusque erat a Curia; Titin. 155, laudor quod osculavi; Afran. 116, proba et pudica quod sum, consulo et parco mihi; 210, defessa expectando domi sedi quod spisso venire visust mihi; Lucil. 26, non tango quod avarus homo est; 123, quod sumptum atque epulas victu proponis honesto; 145, si minus delectat quod technion

¹ Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Conjunctionen *quod* und *quia* im älteren Latein, 1880; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, pp. 20 ff.

Eisocratium est; 388, nupturum te nupta negas quod vivere Ulixem speras? 662, quod te intromisi gratiam referas mihi; 665, cohibet domi se, Albinus repudium quod filiae remisit; Acc. Praet. 8, quod periti sumus in vita atque usu callemus magis; Laelius, Meyer, p. 208, neque tanta dis immortalibus gratia haberi potest quod is in hac civitate natus est.

b) With a correlative *idcirco*: And. 690, idcirco accersor quod sensit; Lucil. 442, tibi istaec res si idcirco est cordi quod rere utilem.

c) With a correlative *ideo*: only Cato (Jord.), 12, 7, ideo graviscae dictae sunt quod gravem aërem sustinent.

d) With correlative *propterea* (4): Amph. 297, propterea quod meus erus fecit ut vigilarem, hic pugnus faciet ut dormiam; And. 37, feci ut esses libertus propterea quod servibas liberaliter; 583, ut me deluderet propterea quod amat filius; Cato (Jord.), 44, 1, propterea quod plures venerant.

e) With correlative *eapropter*: only And. 959, deorum vitam eapropter sempiternam esse arbitror, quod voluptates eorum propriae sunt.

2. Substantive *quod*-clauses. These are partly 'because'-clauses, partly 'that'-clauses.

a) 'Because'-clauses: Amph. 116, ne hunc ornatum admiremini, quod processi cum servili schema; Asin. 315, mirabar quod scapulae gestibant; Bacch. 1072, ne miremini quod non triumpho; so also with *mirari*: Merc. 782; Poen. 1373; Rud. 578, an te paenitet in mari quod elavi, ni in terra iterum eluam? Especially in apposition with neuter pronouns and nouns: Bacch. 1019, quaeso ut sat habeas id, quod Chrysalus me obiurigavit; Most. 16, rus mihi tu obiectas?:: sane hoc, credo, quod scis; Truc. 457, mater dicta quod sum, eo¹ magis studeo vitae; H. T. 910, istuc times quod ille operam amico dat? Eun. 81, vereor ne illud gravius tulerit quod intro missus non est; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 15, Rhodiensibus id oberit, quod non male fecerunt; Hec. 780, ob eam rem¹ iratus est, quod peperit clam; Cato (Jord.), 24, 14, sed si honorem non aequom est haberi ob eam rem quod bene facere voluisse quis dicit; And. 904, una quaevis causa monet, vel tu vel quod verumst vel quod cupio; Eun. 145, multae sunt causae: primum quod soror est dicta.

¹ Clauses following *eo*, *ob eam rem*, are only formally different from clauses following *idcirco*, etc., which were classed as adverbial.

b) 'That'-clauses:

1) In apposition with neuter pronouns: Asin. 262, quid hoc, quod pieus ulmum tundit? 265, quid illuc quod currit huc? Ad. 210, quid istue, Sannio, est quod te audio nescio quid concertasse cum ero? Pacuv. 143, quid quod mihi piget paternum nomen profari? Capt. 357, hoc quidem haud molestumst quod collus collari caret; 358, quod bonis bene fit beneficium, gratia ea (by attraction for *id*) grvida est bonis; Merc. 553, id iam lucrum est quod vivis; 596, id vitium est quod tardus est; And. 764, mitte id quod scio; Hec. 236, non signi hoc sat est, quod heri nemo voluit admittere? Acc. 345, dum illud, quod miser est, clam esse censet alteros; Stat. 174, unum id sat est, quod diu vivendo multa quae non volt videt.

2) With substantives: Merc. 692, parumne est malai rei quod amat Demipho? Pacuv. 277, parum est quod te aetas male habet? Bacch. 1008, tantum flagitium te scire audivi meum, quod cum cubui uxore militis; M. G. 1233, iste metus me macerat quod ille fastidiosus est; H. T. 399, omnes mihi labores fuere quos cepi leves, praeterquam tui carendum quod erat; Ad. 953, vitium commune omniumst, quod nimium attenti sumus; Trag. Inc. Ribb. p. 306, sive est calamitas quod expulisti saucios patrio lare; Cato (Jord.), 22, 2, mihi magnae curae est quod haec res tam secunde processit; 37, 2, (ubi mea oratio scripta erat) de ea re quod sponsionem feceram.

3) With verbs: And. 710, non satis habes, quod tibi dieculam addo? Cato (Jord.), 10, 1, neque satis habuit quod eam in occulto vitiaverat; M. G. 468, nimis beat quod commeatus transtinet; Truc. 581, haud perit quod illum amo; Eun. 926, ut mittam quod ei amorem difficillimum confeci sine molestia; 1002, numquam quicquam quod magis vellem evenire mi evenit quam quod senex intro venit; Ad. 307, quem neque fides neque misericordia repressit neque quod partus instabat; Phor. 168, ut ne addam quod sine sumptu ingenuam, liberalem nactus es, quod habes uxorem; Acc. 209, adde huc quod caelestum pater prodigium misit; Aul. 624, non temere est quod corvos cantat mihi; Phor. 998, non temerest quod tu tam times; Enn. Ann. 366, haud temerest quod gubernas.

3. Further peculiarities in the use of *quod*.

a) *Quod*, 'as to the fact that,' occurs in the following passages: Capt. 586, filium tuom quod redimere se ait, id ne utiquam mihi

placet; Pseud. 101, quod tu istis lacrumis te probare postulas, non pluris refert quam si; Truc. 471, ego quod mala sum, matris opera mala sum; H. T. 16, quod rumores distulerunt, multas contaminasse Graecas: id esse factum non negat; 22, quod malivulus poeta dictitat, repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse, arbitrium vestrum valebit; 204, quod illum insimulat durum, id non est; Eun. 64, quod nunc tecum cogitas, 'ego illam, quae illum, quae me non. . . !' haec verba una falsa lacrimula restinguet; Hec. 437, quod constitui hodie conventurum eum, non posse, ne me frustra exspectet; 581, teque ante quod me amare rebar, ei rei firmasti fidem; SC de philosophis et rhetoribus (161 B. C.), Bruns⁶, 37, quod verba facta sunt de philosophis et rhetoribus, de ea re ita censuerunt.

b) *Quod*, 'in that,' occurs: Most. 303, certe ego, quod ego te amo, operam nusquam melius potui ponere; Acc. Praet. 36, quod dexterum cepit cursum, pulcherrime auguratum est.

c) *Nisi quod*: Capt. 394, nisi quod custodem habeo, liberum me esse arbitror; 621, neque mi esse ullum morbum nisi quod servio; Pers. 517, tantundem scio quantum tu, nisi quod pellegi prior; H. T. 958, qui nescio nec rationem capio, nisi quod tibi bene volo.

d) In Bacch. 668, numqui nummi exciderunt, quod sic terram optuere? the expression seems elliptical. The *quod*-clause really gives the reason for the speaker's asking the question, — 'I ask this because you keep your gaze upon the ground.' Cf. Cicero, in Cat. i, 6, 16, quae quidem quibus abs te initiata sacris ac devota sit, nescio, quod eam necesse putas esse in consulis corpore defigere.

e) In Amph. 303, iam pridem videtur factum heri quod homines quattuor in soporem collocastis, *quod* is used like *quom* in similar expressions; see p. 85. The change from *quod* to *quom* would involve hiatus. Unless we make this change, we must recognize an unexampled use of *quod*.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUIA*.

The *quia*-clauses in Early Latin fall into three main classes: 1) dependent on verbs; 2) in answer to questions; 3) substantive *quia*-clauses.

1. The governing verb is expressed (140).

a) Without correlative.

1) Present tense, (60) e.g. Amph. 640, sola videor quia abest; Asin. 189, quia nil habes, postulas; Aul. 105, discrucior animi quia abeundumst mihi; Capt. 203, at nos pudet quia cum catenis sumus; 259, neque pol tibi nos, quia nos servas, aequomst vitio vortere; Cas. 397, quia tute es fugitivos, omnis te imitari cupis? 700, ingratiis, quia non volt, nubet hodie; Cist. 83, quia nolo, obsecutast; Ep. 77, quia perire solus nolo, te cupio perire mecum; Men. 513, omnis cinaedos esse censes, quia tu es? M. G. 868, quia Sceledrus dormit, hunc ablegavit; Most. 499, me recipere Orcus noluit, quia praemature vita careo; 1116, quia placeo, exemplum expetis; 1132, etiam inrides? :: quian ire autumo? Poen. 101, quia amare cernit, tangere hominem volt bolo; Truc. 707, salvos sum quia pereoo; And. 242, id mutavit, quia me inmutatum videt? Eun. 167, eunuchum dixti velle te, quia solae utuntur his reginae; 282, tibi patent fores, quia istam ducis; Phor. 162, aliis quia deficit quod amant, aegrest; tibi quia superest, dolet; Hec. 215, an quia ruri crebro esse soleo, nescire arbitramini; Ad. 393, non quia ades, dico haec; Cato (Jord.), 73, 4, vitio vortunt quia multa egeo; at ego illis quia nequeunt egere.

There is one instance of the historical present: Rud. 366, insilui-mus, quia videmus. Also one example of the present referring to the future: M. G. 1331, quia abit, animo male factum est.

2) With imperfect: Amph. 352, quia nos eramus peregrini, tutatust domi; Capt. 20; M. G. 54, peditastelli quia erant, sivi viverent; Vid. 71, te abire iussi, quia me miserebat tui; Eun. 620, id faciebat, quia tempus non erat; Hec. 16; Enn. Trag. 208, nominatur Argo, quia Argivi in ea vecti petebant pellem inauratam.

3) Future tense: only Phor. 26, Phormionem nominant, quia primas partis qui aget, is erit Phormio.

4) Perfect tense:

Historical perfect (35), e.g. Amph. 796, me captas, quia tute praecucurristi; Aul. 755, quia sum tangere ausus, haud causificor quin habeam; Bacch. 735, mihi loquitur nec recte quia tibi aurum reddidi; 804; Capt. 58, ne vereamini quia dixi; Cist. 541, vix exsculpsi ut diceret, quia ei promisi; Epid. 137, male feci, quia amor mutavit locum; Pers. 756, gratis ago quia sum ultus; Pseud. 280, hunc pudet quia non dedit; 282; And. 121, quia lamentari visast et quia erat forma honesta, accedo; Eun. 5, sic existumet responsum

quia laesit prior; 682; Phor. 5, dictitat fabulas tenui esse oratione quia nusquam scripsit; 357; Hec. 681, quia clam te natus est, nactus alteram es; Ad. 566, perquam, quia mulierem vicit; Turp. 35, mi est iratus pater, quia se talento tetigi.

Present perfect (15), e.g. Amph. 811, perii miser quia pudicitiae huius vitium est additum; Capt. 152, huic illud dolet, quia nunc remissus est exercitus; Curc. 225, paves quia non rediit; Men. 128, dona quid cessant mihi conferre quia pugnavi fortiter? M. G. 1222, quam laeta est quia ted adiit; Poen. 772, quia sciverunt, eum adlegarunt; Phor. 239, incertumst quid agam, quia praeter spem hoc mi obtigit; Hec. 506; Ad. 35, quia non rediit, quibus sollicitor rebus? 596.

5) Pluperfect tense: Rud. 1187, credebam quia evererat; Eun. 586, quia consimilem luserat ludum, magis animus gaudebat; Hec. 369, continuo voltum earum sensi inmutari, quia tam incommode illis fors obtulerat adventum meum.

b) With correlative *ideo*: Asin. 622, nullum perdidi ideo quia numquam habui; Men. 77, nomen fecit Peniculo mihi, ideo quia mensam detergeo; Merc. 31, hoc ideo fit quia amator profert; 543; Hec. 218, ideo quia, ut domi mihi vos eritis, proinde ego ero fama foris.

c) With correlative *propterea*: As. 385, censebam attigisse propterea quia huc habebas iter; Men. 45, propterea memini, quia vidi; 263, propterea huic urbi nomen Epidamno inditum est, quia nemo sine damno devortitur; M. G. 1257, quia me amat, propterea Venus fecit; 1323; Most. 1155, illum prodire pudet propterea quia fecit; Poen. 62; Turp. 182, mihi videre tuo more aegre id pati, quia hos dies complusculos intercapedo sumpti faciundi fuit.

d) With correlative *idcirco*: Merc. 34, hoc idcirco praedico quia nullus amator adeost facundus.

e) *Nisi quia*: Ad. 523, nulla alia causa odi nisi quia propest.

2. The governing verb is not expressed, but is implied in a question to which the *quia*-clause is the answer (150).

a) In answer to questions with *quid* (60), e.g. Amph. 52, quid contraxistis frontem? quia tragoediam dixi futuram hanc? Aul. 427, in aedibus quid tibi erat negoti? :: quia venimus coctum ad nuptias; Bacch. 328, quid opust anulo? :: quia id signumst cum Theotimo;

Capt. 174, quid tu id quaeris? :: quia mist natalis dies; Cas. 91, quid me sequere? :: quia certumst mihi; Cure. 135, quid lubet perditum dicere te esse? :: quia id quod amo careo; Merc. 454, quid mea refert? :: quia illi suam rem esse aequomst in manu; Most. 1003, quid res novas requiritas? :: quia hodie adveni; Poen. 637, quid ad me attinet? :: quia venimus; Pseud. 1087, quid non metuum? :: quia numquam abducat; H. T. 801, quid tum? quia videbitur magis veri simile esse; Eun. 88; Phor. 601, quid pertinui? an quia duo sunt mihi dati? 788.

Especially common is *quid ita*, *quid iam*, e.g. Bacch. 254, quid ita? :: quia scio; 680; Cure. 48; Epid. 58, quid ita? :: quia mittebat; Pers. 592; Eun. 725, quid ita? :: quia iam tum inceperat; Hec. 614; Epid. 407, quid iam? :: quia dixit; 551; M. G. 472, quid iam? :: quia attingere ausu's mulierem; 834; Truc. 133, quid iam? :: quia dixerat.

b) In answer to questions with *qui* (45), e.g. Amph. 666, qui tibi istuc in mentemst? :: quia sero advenimus; 711; Bacch. 1163, qui non? :: quia flagitiumst; Epid. 33, qui? :: quia ante aliis fuit; 97, qui lubidost male loqui? :: quia te deseris; Merc. 612, qui? :: quia aequalem enicas; Poen. 338, qui lubet? :: quia hodie est mercatus; And. 501, qui incidit suspicio? :: quia te noram; 954; Eun. 121, qui? :: quia neque tu uno eras contenta, neque solus dedit; 745; Phor. 330, qui istuc? :: quia non rete accipitri tennitur.

Often with appended *-dum*, e.g. Most. 450, quidum? :: sic, quia foris ambulatis; Epid. 299, quidum? :: quia alius illam deperit; Pseud. 337, quidum? :: quia numquam eris; Rud. 1116; Truc. 732, quidum? :: quia plus dedi; Eun. 273, quidum? :: quia tristi's.

Occasionally the question is indirect: Aul. 563, volo scire qui sit agnus curio. :: quia ossa ac pellis est; Poen. 896, cedo qui credam. :: quia illas emit.

c) In answer to questions with *cur* (20), e.g. Amph. 687, cur negas? :: quia vera didici dicere; Capt. 715, cur iratus es? :: quia illi fuisti fidelior; 985; Cure. 437, cur non venit? :: quia venimus; Epid. 576, cur? :: quia neque scio neque novi; Merc. 648, cur istuc coeptas consilium? :: quia me adflectat amor; M. G. 1254, cur non pultas? :: quia non est intus; Most. 1098, cur? :: scies; quia id volo; Hec. 322, quor id non dixti? :: quia non poteram.

d) In answer to *quam ob rem* (10), e.g. Amph. 552, *quam ob rem?* :: *quia id mihi praedicas*; Capt. 669, *quam ob rem suscenses?* :: *quia me delaceravisti*; Cure. 442, *quam ob rem?* :: *quia subegit*; Trin. 985; H. T. 437, *quam ob rem?* :: *quia pessume consulis*; Eun. 907.

e) In answer to questions with *quapropter* (10), e.g. Asin. 630, *quapropter?* :: *quia hanc amo*; Epid. 42, *quapropter?* :: *quia mercatust*; Most. 273, *quapropter?* :: *quia recte olet*; 825; H. T. 188, *quapropter?* :: *quia incertumst*; Hee. 311.

f) In answer to questions with other particles:

1) *Quin*: Merc. 190, *quin apstrudebas?* *quia negotiosi eramus*; Pseud. 501, *quin (cur non, codd) dictumst mihi?* :: *quia illud malum aderat*.

2) *Quo pacto*: Aul. 733, *quo pacto esse possum?* :: *quia istuc facinus ego feci*; M. G. 966.

3) *Quae res*: Poen. 318, *qua de re?* :: *quia venimus*; 733, *qua re?* :: *quia dicetur*; Aul. 423, *quae res?* :: *quia minus quam aequom erat feci*.

4) *Qua ratione*: Pseud. 803, *qua ratione?* :: *quia nemo quaerit*.

5) *Qua gratia*: Amph. 665, *qua gratia?* :: *quia daturus nemost prandium*; Cist. 234; Truc. 288, *quanam gratia?* :: *quia es ausa*.

3. Substantive *quia*-clauses (50).

a) In apposition with neuter pronouns. Here the causal notion is usually very slight, *quia* having the force rather of 'that.' Examples: Aul. 418, *istuc male factum arbitror quia non latus fodi*; Epid. 107, *idne pudet te, quia captivam es mercatus?* M. G. 1210, *istuc acerbumst, quia ero carendumst*; Most. 51, *invidere mihi hoc videre, quia mihi bene est*; Pers. 431, *id tibi suscensui quia te negabas*; Stich. 34, *id doles quia non colunt?* Trin. 394, *hoc unum consolatur me, quia qui consulit, nugas agit*; 1165, *quid ego feci?* :: *meum corrumpi quia perpessus filiam*; Truc. 266, *quid male dico?* :: *quia me truculentum nominas*; Cato (Jord.), 24, 15, *Rhodiensibus id oberit, quia voluisse dicuntur facere?* Hee. 255, *sin ea (for id by attraction) est causa retinendi, quia aegrast*.

b) In apposition with nouns: only Pseud. 689, *mendacium, quod commentus fui, quia lenonis me esse dixi*.

c) As subject of *est*: Asin. 56, *quid morbit?* :: *quia non suppe-*

tunt dictis data; Cas. 378, iniquomst quia isti prius quam mihi est; Stich. 506, ut mihi volup est quia vos domum rediisse video.

d) In apposition with neuter pronouns used as ablatives of cause:

1) With *eo*: Amph. 756, eo fit quia mihi credo; Asin. 620, quia oculi sunt lacrumantis, eo rogavi; Bacch. 317, quia clanculum devenit, eo nescio; Capt. 69, nomen indidit Scorto mihi eo, quia invocatus soleo esse; Cist. 492, eo facetus es, quia tibi alias sponsa; Curc. 61; Pers. 785; 834; Rud. 24, id eo fit quia nihil ei acceptumst; 1114; Stich. 174, Gelasimo nomen mi indidit, quia ridiculus fui, eo quia paupertas fecit ut; Truc. 272; H. T. 505, an eo fit, quia sumus praepediti? 786; Eun. 415, eon es ferox, quia habes? Cato, Agr. 6, 4, convenit eo quia foditur; 17, 1, eo quia semen viride habet, matura est.

2) With *istoc*: Amph. 379, ergo istoc magis, quia vaniloquos, vapulabis.

3) With *hoc*: Amph. 254, hoc adeo hoc commemini, quia impransus fui; Rud. 388, hoc sese excruciat quia leno ademit cistulam.

e) In apposition with *ob eam rem*: Epid. 596, ob eam rem emisti, quia ratus es? Men. 1055; Trin. 324, ob eam rem haec autumavi, quia res quaedam est; Ad. 989, ob eam rem quia non obsequor.

f) *Nisi quia*: Pers. 545, iuxta tecum aequo scio, nisi quia specie liberalist; Pseud. 106, id futurum unde dicam nescio, nisi quia futurumst; 567, quo id sim facturus pacto nihil etiam scio, nisi quia futurumst; Rud. 1024, neque scio, nisi quia hunc meum esse dico; Truc. 785, incertus sum, nisi quia timeo; Eun. 736, nescibam id dicere illam, nisi quia correxit miles; Cist. 223, neque, nisi quia non eo pessum, mihi ulla abest peritias. Except in the last of these examples the *quia*-clause is the object of a *scio* to be supplied in thought after *nisi*; cf. Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Conjunctionen *quod* u. *quia*, p. 23. Not strictly an object clause, though obviously modelled on the foregoing, is Trin. 936, sed ego sum insipientior, qui egomet unde redeam hunc rogitem, quae ego sciam atque hic nesciat; nisi quia lubet experiri quo evasurust.

In the following instances *nisi* alone seems to be used in the sense of *nisi quia*: Cist. 676, ubi sit nescio, nisi loca haec circiter mi excidit; 4, qui magis potueris, nescio, nisi non arbitror; Bacch. 324,

nil scio nisi nescio; Epid. 281, quid ego (sc. dicam), nisi te commentum astute intellego? Poen. 649, nescimus; nisi ut processimus, atque videmus; Rud. 750, nescio, nisi scio probiorem hanc esse; Eun. 735, nil dixit? :: nil, nisi abiens mi innuit; 826, nescio; nisi amasse credo Pamphilam.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUONIAM*.

1. Present tense (20).

a) Referring to present time (10), e.g. Amph. 396, quid tibi lubet fac, quoniam plus vales; 835; M. G. 840, quoniam non licet, invides; Pseud. 7, quoniam non potest, necessitas me subigit; Rud. 1122, nunc demum istuc dicis, quoniam ius meum esse intellegis; Trin. 989, quoniam advenis, — vapulabis; And. 250, ea quoniam nemini obtrudi potest, itur ad me; 305.

b) Historical present (10), e.g. Capt. 490, redeo, quoniam video; Cist. 164, quoniam nescit, servom participat consili; Poen. 455, quoniam litare nequeo, abii; Stich. 556; Trin. 14, quoniam video, dedi ei meam gnatam.

2. Perfect tense (20).

a) Present perfect (13), e.g. Amph. 266, quoniam formam huius cepi, decet mores habere me similis; Asin. 711, quid nunc? quoniam nos delusistis; Capt. 930; Men. 1151, quoniam haec evenere, redeamus; Most. 63 pergitte, quoniam ocepistis; And. 595, te oro, quoniam mi effecisti has nuptias; Eun. 237; Afran. 354, quoniam nuptiae sunt dictae, parcas istis verbis.

b) Historical perfect (7), e.g. Amph. 586, quoniam neglexisti, nunc venis; Asin. 152, hic loquar, quoniam intus non licitumst; 847; Acc. 120, ad populum intellego referendum, quoniam aequiter sententiae fuere.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUANDO*.¹

1. Present tense, referring to present time (60), e.g. Amph. 390, non loquar, quando plus vales; 440; Cas. 497, quid opus est, quando domi est? Cist. 532, quando non licet, perdam operam; Curc. 216, migrare certumst, quando sentio; 662; 708; Men. 153, age sane igitur, quando aequom oras; Merc. 472, me morti dabo, quando id

¹ Scherer, De particulae *quando* apud vetustissimos Scriptores Latinos vi et usu, Studemund, Studien, ii, p. 88 ff.

adimitur; M. G. 1227, patiar quando Venus volt; Poen. 447; 1389; Stich. 483; And. 805, ut quimus, quando ut volumus non licet; Eun. 447; Phor. 999, quando nil times, narra; 1034; Hec. 477, quando deputat, segreganda aut mater est aut Philumena; 512; Ad. 348; 437; 802; Stat. 176, patiēre quod dant, quando optata non danunt; 177.

2. Future tense: only Hec. 618, tua re fert nili, quando haec aberit.

3. Perfect tense (25).

a) Present perfect (20), e.g. Capt. 300, quando libertatem perdidī, non censeo; Curc. 527, quando bene gessi rem, volo hic supplicare; M. G. 1085, quin abis, quando responsumst; Poen. 815; Stich. 518, quando ita rem gessistis, pax est; And. 818, duc me ad eam, quando huc veni; Phor. 894, dis magnas merito gratias habeo, quando evenere haec; Ad. 201; 287; 435; Pacuv. 131, ne illum exspectes quando fecisti; Lucil. 145, docebo, quando mansi; 768.

b) Historical perfect (5), e.g. Amph. 891, faciundum est mi quod illaec postulat, quando id Amphitruoni offuit; Bacch. 445; Ad. 296.

4. Pluperfect tense: only Stich. 559, aequom postulabat senex, quando dederat dotem.

5. Quandoquidem (15), e.g. Men. 1024, verum, quandoquidem te servavi; Merc. 171, obsecro, quandoquidem supplicandum video; 180; 618; Truc. 559, quandoquidem perditum se it, eum adiutabo; And. 487, deos quaeso ut sit superstes, quandoquidem ipsest ingenio bono; 608; H. T. 1064, quandoquidem ducendast, habeo; Phor. 403, magistratus adi quandoquidem solus regnas; Hec. 492; Ad. 640; Turp. 127, etiam amplius illam apparare condecet quandoquidem voti condemnata est.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOM*.

Quom causal is a natural outgrowth of *quom* temporal. A typical illustration of the origin is seen in Hec. 385, *quom orata huius reminiscor, nequeo quin lacrumem*, where the meaning partakes both of the temporal and causal forces. There are many such passages, in which it is impossible to determine whether the relation is primarily temporal or causal. The usage is particularly frequent with verbs of emotion (joy, suffering, fear, etc.), verbs of commending, congratulating, thanking, and the like.

1. **With expressions of rejoicing (15)**, e.g. Amph. 681, quom gravidam te aspicio, gaudeo; Cas. 417, quom nos di iuvare, gaudeo; Epid. 711, quom tu es liber, gaudeo; so Men. 1031; 1148; Most. 1128, salvos quom advenis, gaudeo; Truc. 384; Lucil. 709, gaudes, quom de me ista foris sermonibus differs; Turp. 191, quom te salvom video, gliscor gaudio; M. G. 1211, volup est quom evenit; so also Poen. 1326; Rud. 1176; Poen. 1412, quom invenisti, mihi voluptatist; so Rud. 1183; Afran. 183, quom veni, iuvat.

2. **With expressions of fear or pain (15)**, e.g. Pseud. 1114, metuo, quom non adest; 1214, metuo quom verba audio; Hec. 734, timida sum quom venit in mentem; Trin. 289, lacrimas haec quom video eliciunt; Hec. 405, lacrumo quom in mentem venit; Most. 149, cor dolet quom scio; Poen. 842, haec quom video fieri, crucior; so Trin. 1170; 103, quom audio, excrucior; Cist. 77, maceror quom illum exoptavi; Capt. 995, eheu! quom plus minusque feci; so also with interjections of suffering: Men. 303, ei mihi quom nihil est; M. G. 1358; And. 622, ei mihi, quom non habeo spatium.

3. **With expressions of praising:** Capt. 151, laudo quom amici tuom ducis malum; Naev. Com. 3, laudes ago, quom votis me multat meis.

4. **With expressions of thanking (25)**, e.g. Asin. 545, laudes gratiasque habemus magnas, quom —; Capt. 373, gratiam habeo tibi, quom copiam mi facis; 922, Iovi ago gratias, quom te redducem reddiderunt; Cure. 699, Aesculapio habeto, quom pudica es, gratiam; Merc. 843; Most. 432; Poen. 257, eequid gratiae quom te evocavi? 1255; Trin. 505; 821; And. 770, dis pol habeo gratiam, quom adfuerunt liberae; Ad. 138, et est dis gratia quom ita est; Capt. 215, obnoxii vobis sumus, quom facitis nos compotes; M. G. 1419, di tibi bene faciant, quom advocatus mihi bene's; Poen. 208, tibi di dent bona, quom optulisti; similarly Poen. 667; 687; Vid. 86; Ad. 917, di tibi bene faciant, quom video; Capt. 355, di tibi omnia optata offerant, quom me tanto honore honestas.

5. **With expressions of congratulating:** Rud. 1178, quom evenit, gratulor; 1270, gratulabor, quom illam invenit? Truc. 516, quom tu recte provenisti quomque es aucta liberis, gratulor, quom peperisti decus; Afran. 20, quom salvos venis, gratulor dis.

6. **With other expressions (50).**

a) Present tense:

Asin. 515, queror fortunas, quom prohibeor; Bacch. 536, salvos quom advenis, cena detur; similarly Curc. 561; Truc. 127; 359; Capt. 280, quom tanta gratiast, quid divitiae? 371; M. G. 1044, magnum me faciam, quom me conlaudat; Most. 29, illum corruptum duco, quom his factis studet; Pseud. 476, merito esse iratum arbitror, quom apud te parvast ei fides; Stich. 81: Trin. 900, quom hic nugatur, contra nugari lubet; H. T. 842, me fortunatissimum factum puto esse, quom intellego; Phor. 538, quin, quom opust, experiemur? Hec. 482; Ad. 18, eam laudem hic ducit maxumam, quom illis placet qui vobis placent; Enn. Trag. 1, defende quom potes defendere; Pacuv. 206, esse adiutam expetunt quom danunt; Lucil. 122, cenasti numquam bene, quom omnia in ista consumis squilla.

Sometimes the *quom*-clause gives the reason for making a statement or asking a question, and not the reason for the contents of the statement or question, e. g. Amph. 753, quaeso, num tu insanis, quom id me interrogas? Poen. 914, lepidus quom mones; Pseud. 293, quom pietatem te amori video praeverttere, omnes tibi patres sunt? Ad. 897, bonus es quom existumas.

b) Future tense: only Phor. 132, quom tu nil refelles, vincam.

c) Perfect tense (15), e.g. Asin. 82, quom me adiit, cupio; Capt. 411, fecisti ut redire liceat, quom confessus es; Cure. 105; Poen. 1077, iterum gnatus videor, quom te repperi; 1137; Pseud. 906; Rud. 1206, ut rem divinam faciam Laribus, quom auxerunt nostram familiam; And. 488; H. T. 381, laudo et fortunatam iudico, id quom studuisti; Hec. 230; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi, clam tendenda est plaga; Licin. Imbrex, 1.

Praesertim quom occurs Asin. 80, praesertim quom me dignum habuit, me habere honorem decet.

7. Substantive clauses introduced by *Quom Causal*: Amph. 641a, hoc me beat quom perduellis vicit; Bacch. 337, istuc sapienter fecit, quom diviti homini id aurum servandum dedit; H. T. 298, magnum hoc quoque signumst, quom necleguntur internuntii; Pseud. 822, hoc brevem vitam colunt, quom hasce herbas in alvom congerunt; Rud. 1234, isto tu pauper es quom piu's; Truc. 152, istoc tu otiosus es, quom pervorsus es; Phor. 966, hoc fretus, quom e medio excessit (= mortua est).

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUATENUS*.

Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, 12, *quatenus id fieri non potest* (the genuineness of the fragment is disputed by Eduard Meyer and others); Scipio Afr. (Meyer), p. 214, *quatenus castra nostra ita munita erant*.

CAUSAL CLAUSES OF THE TYPE: *QUID EST QUOD?* 'WHAT IS THE REASON WHY?'

The way in which *quod* in expressions of the above type developed its peculiar force is not perfectly clear. Possibly a starting-point was found in expressions like Men. 677, *scin quid est quod ad te venio?* Stich. 107, *quid est istuc quod venis?* 127, *hoc est quod ad vos venio*. In these the *quod* is originally an accusative of the inner object, — 'Do you know what it is on which I am coming to you?' 'What is that errand on which you are coming?' 'This is the errand on which I am coming to you.' But this meaning easily passes into that of 'What reason is there why?' 'This is the reason why.' Assuming that the idiom in question established itself in the way suggested, it would then be easy for its application to be extended to expressions like: Epid. 609, *quid est quod illi caperrat frons*, and others noted below. We recognize several different forms of these clauses:

1. **Type *quid est quod?***: Epid. 609; 570, *quid est quod me excivisti?* Cas. 630, *quid est quod haec huc exsiluit?* Merc. 175, *quin tu expedis quid siet quod me quaerebas?* Most. 69, *quid est quod me nunc obtuere?* Pseud. 9, *quid est quod gestas tabellas?* H. T. 613, *quid est quod crepuerunt fores?* Eun. 558, *quid est quod sic gestis?* 559, *quid est quod laetus es?* 978, *quid est quod trepidas?* Ad. 305, *quidnam est quod sic video timidum Getam?*

2. **Type *quid hoc est quod?***: Cist. 655, *quid hoc est quod cistella hic iacet?* Most. 1062, *quid hoc est quod foris concrepuit?* Eun. 642, *sed quid hoc quod subito egreditur?* Merc. 368, *sed istuc quid est tibi quod commutatust color?* Men. 958, *quid illuc est quod med insanire praedicant?* Merc. 120, *quid illuc est quod ille tam expedite exquirat cursuram?* Acc. 299, *quid istuc est quod me a tecto excies?*

3. **Type *quid hoc negotist quod?***: Bacch. 415, *quid hoc negotist*

Lydus quod erum ciet? Cist. 774, quid hoc negotist quod omnes homines fabulantur per vias mihi esse filiam inventam? Men. 762, quidnam hoc sit negoti quod filia repente expetit me? Rud. 559, quid illuc negoti quod duae mulierculae signum tenent?

4. **Type *hoc est quod*:** Cas. 531, hoc erat quod vir tanto opere orabat meus; Men. 1135, hoc erat quod haec te meretrix huius vocabat nomine; Merc. 711, hoc est ire quod rus meus vir noluit; Acc. 96, hocinest quod tam temeriter tu meam benevolentiam interis es ratus? Rud. 1258, illuc est quod nos nequam servis utimur; Hec. 273, nam est quod me transire oportet.

RELATIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES.

Attention is called below (p. 292 ff.) to certain classes of descriptive clauses in the subjunctive which have an accessory notion of cause. Many clauses of the same logical value and of the same form (barring the mood) stand in the indicative. In connection with descriptive causal clauses in the subjunctive we shall note that the antecedent of the relative is more commonly in the first or second persons, and that the causal clause often denotes the reason for the speaker's making a statement or asking a question. The same is true in case of those indicative clauses now to be considered.

1. **Antecedent in first person**, e.g. Amph. 325, infelix fui, qui non alas intervelli; Men. 852, sumne ego mulier misera quae illae audio? Merc. 588, sumne ego miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere? Pers. 75, sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam? 474, sumne probus, qui civitatem auxi? Rud. 1184, sumne ego scelestus, qui excepi? And. 646, me miserum, qui tuum animum ex animo spectavi meo. With these cf. such passages as Men. 443, incitus qui postulem; Merc. 701, miserior me quae nupserim; 920, ego stultior qui credam, in which the subjunctive is used. Other examples of the indicative are: Asin. 300, ego, qui te expendi, scio; 617, scio, qui periculum feci; Aul. 796, quae eiulas, quem avom feci? Merc. 151, opera licet experiri, qui me rupi causa tua; M. G. 1376, stulte feci, qui hunc amisi; Most. 301, egone id exprobrem, qui mihimet cupio id opprobrarier! 776, quid mihi fiet, qui solus facio? Rud. 274, nunc amplectimur genua, quae in locis nesciis sumus; 516, est quod habeas gratiam mihi, qui te ex insulso salsum feci;

640; 994, ego, qui sum piscator, scio; Eun. 292, neque virgost usquam neque ego, qui illam a conspectu amisi meo; 1004, mihi solae ridiculo fuit, quae quid timeret scibam.

2. Antecedent in the second person: Asin. 227, tua ista culpast, quae amoves; Cas. 645, excetra tu, ludibrio me quae habuisti; Cist. 291, utrum deliras, qui me iubes? Men. 292, insanum esse te scio, qui mihi molestus es; 299, ubi ego te noverim, qui amicam habes eram meam? Merc. 177, credo, instes acriter, qui nunc flagitas; 873, male facis, properantem qui me commorare; Most. 251, quid opust speculo tibi, quae tute speculo speculum es? 438, peccavisti largiter, qui occasionem hanc amisisti; 1014, quid somnias? :: egone? :: at quidem tu, qui speras; 1142; Pers. 747; Poen. 852, haud amice facis, qui offers moram; Pseud. 378, frustra es, qui postulas; Rud. 1166, te di perdant, qui me hodie vidisti; H. T. 589, di te eradicent, qui me hinc extrudis; Phor. 156, rogitas, qui tam audacis facinoris mihi conscius? Turp. 117, sanusne es, qui temere lamentare?

3. Antecedent in the third person: Bacch. 455, fortunatum Nicobulum, qui illum produxit sibi; 485, illum perisse dico, quod perit pudor; 1134; Cas. 552, flagitium hominis, qui dixit; 657, imitatur malam disciplinam, viro quae suo interminatur; Men. 309, insanit hicquidem, qui male dicit sibi; cf. 312, tu quidem non sanus, qui male dicas tibi, where the subjunctive is used; M. G. 1081, quot ipse annos vivet, quous filii tam diu vivont? Stich. 340, at ego perii, quod medullam lassitudo perbibit; 341; 561; Truc. 413, tu te pro puerpera hic procuras? :: quippini, ubi sine labore res geri pulchre potest?

4. Quippe qui occurs in the following instances: Amph. 21, quod dictum foret, seibat facturos, quippe qui intellexerat; 745; Epid. 618, quippe ego quod libertas in mundo sitast; Pseud. 1274, ad hunc me modum intuli illis satis facete ex disciplina, quippe ego qui probe Ionica perdidici; Rud. 384. *Quippe quo* is read by most recent editors (following Lambinus) in Bacch. 368, ianua hanc Orci, quippe quo (qui, cui, *codd*) nemo advenit, nisi quem spes reliquere.

ADVERSATIVE CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.¹

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *etsi*, *tam etsi*, *etiam si*, *tamen si*, *tamen etsi*.

1. Introduced by *etsi* (40): Bacch. 1191, *etsi est dedecori, patiar*; Capt. 543, *sum servus, etsi domi liber fui*; 742, *etsi pervivo, tamen breve spatiumst perferundi*; 744; 842; Cas. 957, *vapulo invitus, etsi merui*; M. G. 407, *non vidi, etsi vidi*; 532, *etsi east, non est ea*; Most. 609a, *etsi procul abest, urit male*; 854; Pers. 272, *mane etsi properas*; 655, *etsi res sunt fractae, amici sunt tamen*; Poen. 1084, *facito reddas, etsi hic habitabit*; Pseud. 1113, *etsi abest, arbitror*; Rud. 1044, *etsi ignotust, notus (est)*; 1350; Trin. 383, *etsi advorsatus tibi fui, istae iudico*; 527; 600; And. 374, *ibo, etsi me spes haec frustratast*; 348; H. T. 119, *ambo accusandi*; *etsi illud inceptum animist pudentis signum*; 225; 327; 624; Eun. 968, *dicam etsi scio*; Phor. 407, *etsi mihi facta iniuriast, verum tamen abduc hanc, minas v accipe*; Hec. 243, *etsi scio, tamen faciam*; 258; 404; 505; 578; 788; 834; Ad. 944, *etsi absurdum videtur, fiat*; Enn. Trag. 165, *etsi dices, facile flexeris*; Pacuv. 206, *etsi perdunt, tamen expetunt*; Acc. 234, *etsi sunt datae fruges, tamen enitent*; 616; Titin. 119, *etsi tacebit, tamen gaudebit*.

2. Introduced by *tam etsi* (*tametsi*) (21): Amph. 21, *me misit, tam etsi scibat*; 977, *audis quae dico, tam etsi praesens non ades*; Aul. 768, *tam etsi fur es, molestus non ero*; Capt. 321, *ne, tam etsi unicus sum, videatur*; Cure. 259, *tam etsi non novi, dabo*; 504; Men. 92, *numquam fugiet, tam etsi capital fecerit*; M. G. 744, *tam etsi dominus non invitus patitur, servi murmurant*; Pers. 362, *tam etsi id futurum non est, quanta adficetur miseria*; Poen. 342, *proba mers facile emptorem reperit, tam etsi in apstruso sitast*; 1201; Pseud. 244, *tam etsi occupata's, moramur*; 471; Stich. 41, *tam etsi es maior, moneo ut memineris*; Stich. 205, *tam etsi haud indignos iudico, nil moror*; And. 348, *obtundis, tam etsi intellego?* Eun. 316, *tam etsi bonast natura, reddunt iunceam*; Phor. 428, *metuit, tam etsi dissimulat*; Lucil. 145, *tam etsi non quaeris, docebo*; 652, *auxilium, tam etsi est indignus, feram*.

3. Introduced by *etiam si*: Cas. 93, *etiam si in crucem vis pergere,*

¹Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, p. 54 ff.

sequi decretumst; Epid. 518, etiam si alterum tantum perdundumst, perdam potius quam sinam; Hec. 648, etiam si dudum fuerat ambiguom, nunc non est.

4. Introduced by *tamen etsi*: M. G. 1209, tamen etsi istuc mihi acerbumst, saltem id volup est; Most. 1167, verberibus caedere. : : tamen etsi pudet? Enn. Ann. 344, tamen etsi res bene gesta est, corde suo trepidat; And. 864, te commotum reddam. : : tamen etsi hoc verum est?

5. Introduced by *tamen si*: Cas. 795, tamen hercle si esurit, nullum esurit.

6. For adversative ("concessive") clauses introduced by *si*, see under "Conditional Sentences," p. 78 ff.

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *quamquam*.

1. Without correlative particle in the main clause: Asin. 710, asta ut descendam, quamquam nequam es; 831; Aul. 359, quamquam Volcano studes, cenaene causa nos nostras aedis postulas comburere? 679, inde observabo, quamquam hic manere me iusserat; Bacch. 1171a, quamquam tu bella es, malum tibi dabo; Cas. 263; 727, mane quamquam fastidis; Cist. 106, quamquam erit molestum, faciam; 307; Men. 1048, ibo intro ad hanc, quamquam suscenset mihi; Merc. 287, quamquam negotiumst, non sum occupatus; 800, quamquam tu irata es, iubeas; M. G. 758, numquam dicunt, quamquam adpositumst ampliter; 1231; 1319; Pers. 337, quamquam studes, filiam vendas tuam? 615; Poen. 515; 621, te salutamus, quamquam hanc salutem ferimus inviti et quamquam bene volumus; 638; 858; 1407; Pseud. 372; 786; 1049, quamquam nequam homo's, recte mones; Rud. 1041, quamquam istuc esse ius meum certo scio, fiat istuc; 1043; Trin. 842, quamquam domi cupio, opperiar; 1112; 1184; Truc. 317; 780; 910; 922; 923; Ad. 159, quamquamst scelestus, non committet; 205, possum ferre, quamquam iniuriumst; Pacuv. 259, quamquam graviter cernimus ictum, nimis paene animo es molli; 304, quamquam aetas senet, satis habeam virium; Acc. 56, quamquam exanguet corpus mi; Stat. 21, quamquam advenio, ne reare; Enn. Ann. 28, 15, nec se dedit, quamquam manus tendebam; Afran. 10, quamquam non exercetur, delaborat.

2. With correlative particle (*tamen, verum tamen, at, tam*) in main

clause: Asin. 497, *quamquam* sum sordidatus, frugi tamen sum; Cas. 421, *quamquam* hoc tibi aegre est, tamen fac accures; Cist. 633, *quamquam* te carebo, animum ego inducam tamen; M. G. 1354, *quamquam* fideliores habuisti, tamen tibi habeo magnam gratiam; Pers. 170, *quamquam* vinum bibo, at mandata non consuevi bibere una; 314, verum tamen, *quamquam* res nostrae sunt pauperculae, modeste meliust vitam vivere; Poen. 196, *quamquam* Cupido in corde vorsatur, tamen auscultabo; 536, tamen, *quamquam* sumus pauperculi, est domi quod edimus; Stich. 722, *quamquam* gravatus fuisti, non nocuit tamen; Trin. 259, *quamquam* illud est dulce, Amor amara dat tamen; H. T. 53, *quamquam* haec nuper notitia est nec quicquam fuit, tamen virtus tua facit; Eun. 172, *quamquam* cupio atque arbitror, tamen faciam; Titin. 157, *quamquam* estis nihili, tam (= *tamen*) ecaster simul vobis consului; Afran. 124, *quamquam* non tam calleo, tamen fefelli; Cato (Jord.), 33, 4, *quamquam* fecere, tamen nequeo desinere.

3. A few instances of corrective *quamquam* also occur: Asin. 78, *quamquam* illum mater arte habet; Aul. 123, *quamquam* haud falsa sum nos odiosas haberi; Capt. 272, *quamquam* non multum fuit molesta servitus; Amph. 491; Trin. 787.

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *quom*.

1. Without correlative particle in the main clause: Amph. 828, *quom* de illo Sosia mirumst, certe de istoc Amphitruone iam alterum mirumst magis; Bacch. 1004, sat sic suspectus sum *quom* careo noxia; 1138a, ne balant quidem, *quom* a pecu cetero absunt; Capt. 244; 423; Men. 843, insanire me aiunt, ultro *quom* ipsi insaniunt; Most. 168, quid te exornas, *quom* lepida tute es? Poen. 235, *quom* munditer nos habemus, vix amatorculos invenimus; Pseud. 1030, *quom* haec metuo, metuo ne advenat; Stich. 34, quia officium non colunt, *quom* tu tuom facis; Truc. 191, palam *quom* mentiuntur, verum esse credimus; 888, *quom* multum apstulimus, haud multum apparet; Phor. 22, finem faciam dicundi, peccandi *quom* ipse finem non facit.

2. With correlative particle (*tamen*, *tum*, *tam*) in the main clause: Cist. 1, *quom* te amavi et crevi, tum id hodie aperuisti; Most. 858, servi, qui *quom* culpa carent, tamen malum metuunt; Rud. 382,

qui it lavatum, quom vestimenta servat, tamen surripiuntur; Stich. 745, quom lautast, infectast tamen; Truc. 704, quom hoc volup est, tum illuc magnae mellinae mihi; And. 96, quom id mihi placebat, tum uno ore omnes omnia bona dicere; Eun. 243, nil quom est, nil defit tamen; Phor. 187, quom mihi paveo, tum Antipho me excruciat animi; Titin. 156, bene quom facimus, tam (= *tamen*) male subimus.

Indicative Adversative Clauses Introduced by Relative Pronouns.

Instances of this type are exceedingly rare. I have noted only Amph. 134, illa illum censet virum esse, quae cum moechost; 561, audes praedicare domi te esse, qui ades?

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *utut* (*ut ut*).

The main clause of such periods often contains a correlative *tamen*.

Examples: Amph. 397, utut es facturus, hoc quidem haud reticebo; 1100, gaudeo, utut me erga meritast; Bacch. 403, utut eris, haud celabis; 1191, id utut est, patiar; Cist. 109, utut est meritust, in cordi est tamen; Merc. 558, utut est, non ibo tamen; Most. 545, utut res sese habet, pergam turbare porro; Poen. 833, qui habet quod det, utut homo est, omnia genera recipiuntur; Pseud. 310, utut est, mihi mortuos est; H. T. 200, utut erat, mansum oportuit; Phor. 468, utut erant alia, illi certe consuleres; 531; Ad. 248, utut haec sunt acta, meum mihi reddatur; 629, non me hanc rem patri, utut erat gesta, indicasse.

INDICATIVE CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY LOCAL PARTICLES.

The local particles *ubi*, *qua*, *quo*, *unde*, used in a relative function, occur very frequently in indicative clauses in Early Latin. They present no features of importance, however, and a few citations under each will suffice.

1. **Clauses introduced by *ubi*:** Bacch. 1107, ibi sum esse ubi miserum hominem decet; Capt. 323, illi ubi minime honestumst; 508, ad fratrem abii, ubi sunt captivi; Cist. 211, ubi sum, ibi non sum; ubi non sum, ibi est animus; Cist. 319; Men. 10; Eun. 537, ut transeas ubi est; Hec. 217, illi ubi sum; Cato, Agr. 84, videto ut percocas ubi altissimum est; Enn. Trag. 203; Acc. 154.

Ubi ubi: Cas. 722, ubi ubi sunt, damno dominos multant; Epid.

492, *illam requiram ubi ubi est*; M. G. 399; Rud. 1210; And. 684; Eun. 295.

Ubi is freely used where we should normally find a relative pronoun with a preposition: e.g. Epid. 219, *cum illa ubi rem properat perdere*; Pseud. 771, *servitus ubi praefulcior*; Rud. 1110, *vidulum ubi sunt signa*; Cato, Agr. 14, 5.

Sicubi is found: Eun. 403, *sicubi eum satietas aut negoti si quando odium ceperat. . . . nostin?* Cato, Agr. 6, 3, *sicubi locus unec-tus erit, ibi serito*; 32, 2, *sicubi opus erit, de arbore deiciantur*; 155, 2, *in fossis, sicubi aqua constat*.

Ubiquomque occurs As. 110, *ubi eris? :: ubi quomque lubitum erit animo meo*; Cas. 226, *ubiquomque est lepidum unguentum, unguor*.

Utrubi is found Stich. 750, *utrubi tu vis*.

2. Clauses introduced by *qua*, e.g. Aul. 647, *tempta qua lubet*; Men. 237, *omnis oras qua adgreditur mare sumus circumvecti*; Truc. 304; Cato, Agr. 1, 3, *prope amnis qua naves ambulant*; Naev. Trag. 19.

Quaqua is found M. G. 92, *deridiculost quaqua incedit*.

3. Clauses introduced by *quo*, e.g. Aul. 657, *abi quo lubet*; Capt. 370, *huc vel illuc vortar, quo imperabitis*; Men. 516, *non tu abis quo dignus es?* 1029; Merc. 649; H. T. 813, *ibin quo dignus es?* Eun. 124, *sine me pervenire quo volo*; Phor. 641; 893; Cato, Agr. 106, *ex alto sumito, quo aqua duleis non accedit*; 112, 1.

Equivalent to a relative pronoun with a preposition: Pers. 201, *eius quo sum missus*; Trin. 400, *aperiuntur aedes quo ibam*; Cato, Agr. 101, *vas quo condideris, oblinito*.

Quoquo: Merc. 857, *certa rest me usque quaerere illam quoquo abductast*; Pseud. 858, *quoquo spectabit, spectato*; Phor. 551, *quoquo asportabitur, certumst persequi*.

4. Clauses introduced by *unde*: Cist. 62, *indidem unde oritur, facito ut facias stultitiam sepelibilem*; Men. 56, *illuc redeo unde abii*; Merc. 511, *illim unde huc advecta sum*; Rud. 412, *petam hinc aquam unde mi imperavit*; Truc. 131, *oles, unde es, disciplinam*; Phor. 604, *petam hinc unde institi*.

Unde equivalent to a relative pronoun with a preposition: Most. 547, *conveni illum unde hasce aedis emeram*; 997, *eccum unde aedis filius emit*; Pers. 559, *haec unde aberunt, ea urbs moenita sat erit*; Rud. 690, *signum unde abreptae (sc. sumus)*; Phor. 748, *cum hac*

familia unde exis ; 967, quom e medio excessit, unde haec susceptast ; 1017, mulierculam eam compressit unde haec natast ; Ad. 302, tot res circumvallant se unde emergi non potest ; Cato, Agr. 58, oleas, unde minimum olei fieri poterit ; Enn. Trag. 2, subices umidas unde oritur.

CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOTIENS*.

Examples : Epid. 175, quotiens vides, sacruficas ; Men. 114, quotiens foras ire volo, me retines ; Truc. 195, horresco, mentio quotiens fit partionis ; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quotiens ibis, totiens magis placebit ; 59, quotiens dabis, accipito ; 151, 4, quotiens opus erit, purges ; Jord. 62, 1.

Quotiensquomque occurs Capt. 97, quotiensquomque conspicio, fleo ; Truc. 282 ; Cato, Agr. 151, 4.

CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOAD*.

Quoad occurs twice only with the indicative in Early Latin, viz. : Asin. 296, iubeo te salvere voce summa, quoad vires valent ; Men. 769, verum est modus tamen quoad pati uxorem oportet. In the first of these passages *quoad* has the signification 'as far as' ; in the second it is equivalent to *ad quem*.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

ORIGINAL FORCE OF THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE.¹

The Greek name for mood was *ἐγκλίσις*, literally 'inclination,' or 'turn,' i.e. 'turn of thought.' Sometimes also we find the designation *διάθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς* or *διάθεσις ψυχική*, 'mental attitude,' or 'condition.' The Romans regularly employed the designation *modus* for the conception of mood. Yet traces of the influence of the Greek designation are still to be seen in definitions given by Roman grammarians. Thus Priscian, Keil, Gr. Lat. ii, p. 421, 17, defines *modi* as *diversae inclinationes animi, varios eius affectiones demonstrantes*, a definition which embraces both the conception in *ἐγκλίσις* and that in *διάθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς*. Diomedes, Keil, Gr. Lat. i, p. 338, gives the heading: *De modis sive inclinationibus*, indicating that *inclinatio* was sometimes used as an alternative designation with *modus*.

The Greeks recognized five *ἐγκλίσεις*, viz. *ὀριστική* (Indicative),

¹ Of the extensive literature on this subject, the following is the most important: Delbrück, *Gebrauch des Conjunktivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, 1871, p. 11 ff.; *Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, 1879, p. 115 ff.; *Altindische Syntax*, 1888, p. 302 ff.; *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, ii, p. 349 ff.; 365 ff.; Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*³, p. 498 ff.; *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, p. 578 ff.; Blase, *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, iii, 1, p. 112 ff.; Bergaigne, *De coniunctivi et optativi in Indo-Europaeis linguis informatione et vi antiquissima*, 1877, p. 41-50; 57-73; Hale, *Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin*, 1894, p. 6 ff.; *A Century of Metaphysical Syntax*, Congress of Arts and Sciences, Universal Exposition, 1904, iii, p. 191 ff.; Dräger, *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, i, p. 304 ff.; Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, ii, p. 130; Schmalz, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 328 ff.; Morris, *The Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus*, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 133 ff.; 275 ff.; 383 ff.; *On Principles and Methods in Syntax*, Chaps. iii, iv (cf. the criticism by Delbrück, in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 1902, p. 333 ff.); Lattmann, *De coniunctivo latino*, 1896; *Bedeutung der Modi*, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 1903, p. 410 ff.; Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, p. 371 ff.; Mutzbauer, *Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen*, 1908, p. 4 ff.; 143 ff.; Kruczkiewickz, *Zeitschrift für österreichische Gymnasien*, 1894, p. 694 ff.; Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums*, 1907, p. 220 ff.; Bréal, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, xi, p. 273 ff.; Sonnenschein, *Unity of the Latin Subjunctive*, 1910, appeared as this chapter was going through the press.

προστακτική (Imperative), εὐκτική (Optative), ὑποτακτική (Subjunctive), ἀπαρέμφατος (Infinitive).

Two of these Greek designations are of importance here, viz. εὐκτική and ὑποτακτική. The name εὐκτική was good for only a small portion of the uses of the Greek optative, viz. its employment in wishes. It did not apply with accuracy to the potential uses of the mood. The Romans, having no special verbal forms recognized as optative, had no need of the designation *modus optativus*. Yet they sometimes used it, *ad imitationem Graecorum*, as Priscian remarks (Keil, Gr. Lat. ii, p. 407). But it should be noted that the Romans never used the name *optativus* to designate a group of inflected forms. With them it designated merely a syntactical use of the subjunctive, viz. the subjunctive in wishes. They thus made the name narrower than the Greek εὐκτική, whose syntactical province extended beyond what its title designated.

Ἐγκλισις ὑποτακτική meant 'mood of subordination,' and was the Greek designation for what we ordinarily call the subjunctive. But the name was a poor one, since it applied only to the uses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, and implied that these represented the original function of the mood. It ignored the independent volitive uses (hortatory, jussive, deliberative, prohibitive), also the pure future uses.

The Romans translated ὑποτακτική by *subiunctivus*; less frequently by *coniunctivus*, designations quite as misleading, of course, as the Greek original from which they were taken.

The Latin subjunctive, as is well recognized, is the result of a fusion of two original moods of the Indo-European parent-speech, the subjunctive and optative. Greek and Sanskrit kept these distinct from each other, but in Latin they early became merged in a single mood endowed with the characteristic meanings of each. The following table indicates the origin of the different formations appearing in the so-called Latin subjunctive:

SUBJUNCTIVE FORMS.	OPTATIVE FORMS.
1. All regular presents, e.g. <i>amem</i> , <i>moneam</i> , <i>regam</i> , <i>audiam</i> .	1. Presents in <i>-im</i> , e.g. <i>sim</i> , <i>possim</i> , <i>nolim</i> , <i>malim</i> , <i>velim</i> , <i>edim</i> , <i>duim</i> .
2. All imperfects, e.g. <i>amarem</i> , <i>mone-rem</i> , <i>essem</i> , etc.	2. All perfects, e.g. <i>viderim</i> , <i>amave-rim</i> , etc.
3. All pluperfects, e.g. <i>amavissem</i> , <i>dixissem</i> , etc.	

It has been stated above that the Latin subjunctive, as containing both subjunctive and optative forms inherited from the Indo-European parent-speech, possessed the characteristic meanings of both moods. Yet for more than a century there have existed wide differences of opinion as to the fundamental values of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative, and even to-day final judgment cannot be said to have been reached. Certain scholars, in fact, deny that either of these moods in Indo-European possessed any fairly definite basal meaning. I shall content myself with giving a brief outline of the history of opinion on this topic, with an indication of the reasons which have determined my own conclusions.

For nearly seventy years after the beginning of the nineteenth century the dominant conceptions concerning the moods were almost exclusively metaphysical. In the province of Greek grammar, this may be seen in Gottfried Hermann's definition of the subjunctive as the mood of objective possibility, and of the optative as the mood of subjective possibility. Later the optative came to be quite generally regarded as the "mood of an act conceived" ("Modus der Vorstellung, Modus des rein Gedachten"); while the Greek subjunctive was generally held to be the mood of an act conditioned. See especially Hale, *A Century of Metaphysical Syntax*, op. cit. p. 191 ff. For Latin, the prevalent view came to be that the subjunctive was the "mood of an act conceived," and this conception is found not only in Zumpt (*Lat. Gramm.* § 78), Madvig (*Lat. Gramm.* § 346), Kühner (*Ausführliche lat. Gramm.* ii, p. 130), and in Dräger (*Hist. Syntax der lat. Spr.* i, p. 305), but was also accepted by Schmalz in the first edition of his *Syntax und Stilistik* (1885); while in his *De coniunctivo latino* and his *Bedeutung der Modi*, loc. cit. p. 414 ff., Lattmann refers a large group of Latin subjunctive uses to an Indo-European "fictivus," which he regards as representing one phase of the original optative, but which is merely a "Modus der Vorstellung" under a new name.

In his *Gebrauch des Conjunktivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, published in 1871, Delbrück broke new ground. Basing his conclusions upon the employment of the subjunctive and optative in independent sentences in the oldest monuments of Sanskrit and Greek, he recognized two fundamental forces for the Indo-

European subjunctive: will and pure futurity; likewise two for the optative: wish and potential force. In case of the subjunctive, Delbrück regarded the 'will' notion as original; the future force as derived from this. In case of the optative, he regarded the 'wish' notion as original; the potential as derived from that. Delbrück's essential positions were soon assailed. In an essay entitled, *De coniunctivi et optativi in Indo-Europaeis linguis informatione et vi antiquissima*, pp. 41 ff. and 57 ff., Bergaigne questioned the justification of attaching to either subjunctive or optative the meanings assigned to these moods by Delbrück. He points out that in the oldest Sanskrit there are instances where the subjunctive denotes a wish and the optative denotes an act of willing. In Greek, Bergaigne admits, there is substantial conformity of usage to Delbrück's theories, but this he explains as a special Greek development. Originally, he holds, the subjunctive and optative possessed no such precise meaning as attached to them by Delbrück, but covered all the ground of modality outside the field of categorical statement occupied by the indicative. He was influenced to this conclusion by his belief that in the development of language the direction of movement is from the vague to the more definite.

Delbrück in his *Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, published soon after Bergaigne's essay, p. 115 ff., replies briefly to Bergaigne's criticisms. He admits that in the history of grammatical forms we cannot with certainty go back beyond a variety of typical usages; but that this variety represents the original state of affairs, must, in view of what we know from other sources concerning the development of language, be characterized as improbable. Delbrück further admits that in Vedic Sanskrit the distinction in the use of moods is not as consistent as in Greek. But he suggests that the freedom referred to may be a result partly of the type of literature to which the Vedas belong. At all events Delbrück thinks it incontrovertible that no small number of subjunctive and optative uses in Sanskrit, Iranian, and Greek show such an agreement that they can be explained only as the result of historical development from a common origin.

As to the relation of the two uses of the subjunctive to each other, and of the two uses of the optative to each other, Delbrück suggests

the possibility of starting in the case of the subjunctive with the pure future meaning; and in case of the optative with the notion of remoter futurity. But he does not discuss this further, merely observing that any such conception of relationships would involve an entirely different classification of the material as treated in his earlier work.

In his *Altindische Syntax*, however, published in 1888, p. 302, Delbrück expressly recognizes the difficulty of deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish, and simply contents himself with recognizing the respective uses without attempting to explain the relationship. As regards the subjunctive, he apparently still holds to the derivation of the future use from the subjunctive of will.

Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, p. 371 ff., while recognizing the essential forces of the subjunctive and optative as outlined by Delbrück, disputes Delbrück's view that the notion of will is basal in the subjunctive, and the notion of wishing in the optative. Goodwin believes that in the case of each mood the process was exactly the reverse. In the case of the subjunctive he urges that it is relatively easy to derive the 'will' uses from the idea of simple futurity. Thus in *ἴωμεν*, 'we shall go,' and in *ἴωμεν*, 'let us go,' we have in each case a future notion; in the second case we have something in addition. Thus by assuming the future notion as basal, we secure the advantage of finding our basal notion present in both instances, whereas if we start with the 'will' notion as basal, we have in the future use of the subjunctive no trace of the original idea. Similarly Goodwin finds difficulty in deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish. "Surely," says he, "*ἀπόλοιτο ἄν*, 'he would perish,' can never have developed from *ἀπόλοιτο*, 'may he perish'; for the former is no more likely to be said by anyone who wishes the death of a person than by one who fears it." In view of the difficulty of deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish, Goodwin therefore urges starting with the potential meaning as basal, and would derive the optative of wish from that,—in what way, he does not make clear.

A more recent statement of Delbrück's position is found in his *Vergleichende Syntax*, ii, p. 346 ff. Here, in discussing the subjunctive, he recognizes the two fundamental meanings of will and futu-

rity, but enters into no discussion of their relationship. With regard to the optative, he recognizes three uses: of wish, prescriptive, and potential, deriving the second and third from the first. He thus returns to his original position as announced in his *Gebrauch des Conjunktivs und Optativs*. Some of the evidence he brings to bear on the general problem is worth citing here. Thus in Iranian we find the optative of wish and the prescriptive optative. In Germanic the optative occurs in its wishing, prescriptive, and potential functions.

Brugmann follows Delbrück, with certain reservations. In his *Griechische Grammatik*³, § 552, he says, in substance, on the subject of the original value of the subjunctive and optative: "The forms we call subjunctive, the forms we call optative, and the forms we call imperative are severally composed of various morphological elements. Hence it is quite natural that each of these moods should possess a variety of syntactical functions unrelated to each other. E.g. the optative denoted wishing and capacity. Each mood, even in the time of the parent-speech, possessed a variety of functions whose historical relation to each other is not clear. It is, therefore, impossible to postulate a single fundamental meaning for these moods in the *Ursprache*. Much less can we lay down any such single fundamental meaning for them in any single Indo-European language, as Sanskrit, Latin, or Greek." In conformity with this attitude, Brugmann contents himself with recognizing three functions for the Indo-European subjunctive, and two functions for the Indo-European optative. The three functions of the subjunctive are: volitive, deliberative, future. The two functions of the optative are: wishing, potential. While expressly disclaiming any attempt to establish a genetic relationship between these functions, Brugmann nevertheless suggests as regards the optative, that if either of them is to be derived from the other, it is much easier to derive the 'wish' meaning from the potential than *vice versa*, and in support of this he cites (§ 558, κ) the development of the German *mögen*, originally designating potentiality (cf. *es mag sein*), but later acquiring the force of wishing, e.g. *möge es ihm gelingen!*

Morris in *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 392 ff. takes a position closely akin to that of Bergaigne, but somewhat less extreme. Bergaigne had denied to the subjunctive and optative any "Grundbegriff"

whatever. Morris admits for the two moods a vague notion of desire as basal, and believes that this vague notion gradually assumed definiteness as a result of context, verb meaning, voice, tense, number, person, gesture, intonation, etc. As to the way in which the potential force developed in the optative, and the future force in the subjunctive, he is apparently not clear in his conception.

H. Lattmann in his *De conjunctivo latino* (1896) and in an article in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 1903, p. 410 ff., dissents radically from Delbrück's conclusions, both as regards the Indo-European functions of the subjunctive and optative, and the possibility of deriving the future force from the volitive, or the potential idea from that of wishing. To Lattmann's mind the subjunctive functions in Indo-European were two: potential and imperative (= volitive); the optative functions were likewise two: "fictive" and wishing. The potential and "fictive" functions were, according to Lattmann, the original ones; the imperative and wishing functions were derived from these.

Mutzbauer, *Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen*, p. 4 ff., recognizes only the future force as present in the Greek (and Indo-European) subjunctive. For the optative, p. 143 ff., he follows Delbrück.

Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums*, p. 220 ff., is a pronounced adherent of Delbrück, and fortifies his views as to the relationship of the functions of the subjunctive and optative by certain new considerations, which will be mentioned later.

Mention should perhaps also be made of the reactionary view of Kruckkiewickz, set forth in *Zeitschrift für österreichische Gymnasien*, 1894, p. 694 ff. A fundamental postulate with Delbrück had been that the use of the subjunctive and optative in subordinate clauses is later than their use in principal clauses, and that the former are to be explained from the latter. Kruckkiewickz denies the truth of this principle and declares moreover that it breaks down when applied,—especially to Latin,—except in a few instances. He is, therefore, led to seek the original force of the subjunctive elsewhere than in principal sentences, and turns to the testimony of the Latin grammarians, in whose minds, he declares, a just sense of the true force of the mood might be expected still to persist. These, he

urges, not only called the subjunctive the mood of subordination (*subiunctivus*), but they actually *define* it as the mood of subordinate clauses, and declare that it is incapable of independent use. On this basis he declares the subjunctive to be the mood of “a dependent, relative, only partially valid statement” (“ein Modus der unselbständigen, relativen, nur beziehungsweise giltigen Aussage”). The use of the subjunctive in principal clauses Kruczkiewickz explains as derived by ellipsis from its employment in subordinate clauses. He even asserts that the employment of the subjunctive and optative in independent sentences in Indo-European would have been not only unnecessary but superfluous, since the ideas supposed to belong to them were expressed by other formations, e.g. the imperative, the indicative, the future, the conditionalis (as in Sanskrit).

Another radical view is that of Armin Dittmar, set forth somewhat vaguely in his *Studien zur lateinischen Tempus- und Moduslehre*. Dittmar defines the subjunctive as expressing an idea that is “polemisch,” as opposed to the function of the indicative, which he denominates as “souverän.”

Before passing a brief criticism on the foregoing views, it is desirable to get before us as clearly as possible the essential facts of usage of the subjunctive and optative in the different Indo-European languages, so far as they have a bearing on our problem.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

Sanskrit. — *Volitive.* — In its volitive use the subjunctive appears in Sanskrit in expressions like, ‘I am resolved to be a disciple of Brahma;’ ‘we are resolved to find;’ ‘let us confer together;’ ‘mount the chariot;’ ‘listen to my words;’ negative: ‘smite us not in the battle;’ ‘fear not.’

Future. In its future use the Sanskrit subjunctive appears in such expressions as ‘you will please me;’ ‘the red of the morning will appear;’ interrogative: ‘who will give it to you?’

Greek. *Volitive.* In Greek the affirmative volitive uses are confined almost exclusively to the first person, e.g. ἐγὼ δῶ ξείνιον, ‘I am determined to give him a guest-present,’ or ‘let me give him;’ ἡμεῖς φραζώμεθα, ‘let us consider.’ Negative: μὴ λεγώμεθα; μὴ ποιήσης.

Future. The future use in Greek is confined practically to Homer,

and is generally accompanied by *κέν* or *άν*, e.g. *ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηίδα; τάχ' άν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσση*. Without *κέν* or *άν*: *οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδέ ἴδωμαι*.

Latin. *Volitive* uses are well represented in the Latin hortatory, jussive, and prohibitive. Future uses have disappeared, except in so far as they are exhibited in the future indicative in *-am* (*regam, audiam*, etc.), and the future perfect indicative. These formations were by origin subjunctive.

Germanic. In Germanic, subjunctive forms have disappeared, but subjunctive functions (volitive and future) have passed to the optative, as, 'let us make here three tabernacles;' 'be kindly disposed;' 'lie not.'

Slavic. In Slavic also the subjunctive formation has disappeared, but, as in Germanic, traces of the volitive use are found in the optative.

The deliberative also occurs in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Germanic (in the latter, only as a function of optative forms); but this usage, though apparently Indo-European, is probably developed from the volitive.

OPTATIVE.

Sanskrit. *In wishes*, e.g. in such expressions as, 'may I become rich in herds;' 'may we be held righteous in the eyes of the gods;' 'may this blessing be our portion;' negative: 'may he not escape destruction.'

Prescriptive. This is essentially jussive in its character, being employed where the command or direction involves a permanent or habitual line of conduct, as opposed to a single act; e.g. 'let one give a child a name when it is born.'

Potential. Inasmuch as the word 'potential' is loosely used, it may be well to observe that the only uses here referred to by this term are the 'should'-'would' uses, and the 'may' uses, especially the former. 'Can' potentials, so far as they occur, are a late and special development; 'must' potentials do not occur at all. Examples: ('should'-'would' type): 'what would you give him?' 'I should give him to eat.'

Iranian. *In wishes*; e.g. 'may he come to our help.'

Prescriptive; e.g. 'worship me with this ritual.'

Greek. *In wishes*; e.g. ἀμύμονα οἴκοι ἄκοιτιν εὖροιμι; ἔλθοις ἐς πατρίδα; σοὶ δὲ θεοὶ χάριν δοῖεν; μὴ ἀπολοίμην.

Prescriptive; e.g. μὴ ἀθεμίστως εἶη ἄλλ' σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι.

Permissive; e.g. κτήματα δ' αὐτὸς ἔχοις, 'you may have the property.'

Potential. The only certain types are the 'should'-'would' and the 'may' potentials; e.g. οὐκ ἂν δεχοιμὴν τοῦτο; ἔλοιμί κε ἢ κεν ἀλοίην, 'I may slay or I may be slain.' When Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, § 234, renders οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, by 'this could not happen;' ἀνὴρ δέ κεν οὐ τι Διὸς ῥοδὸν εἰρύσσαιτο, by 'a man cannot contend against the will of Zeus,' he seems to me to be substituting an English idiom for an exact translation of the Greek modal force. So in § 235, where he renders πάντες θαυμάζοιεν ἂν τοῦτο, 'all must admire this,' but which can perfectly well mean, 'all would admire.'

Latin. The Latin subjunctive bears witness to its optative inheritance in its use in wishes, and in potential meanings. The 'should'-'would' potential is the main type, but the 'may' potential occurs sparingly (*aliquis dicat, quispiam dixerit*, etc.), while we also find a 'can'-'could' potential in expressions of the type: *videas*, 'one can see'; *videres*, 'one could see.' This, however, seems an outgrowth of the 'should'-'would' use. Delbrück would see traces of the prescriptive use in general directions, e.g. *Cato, Agr. 5, 1, disciplina bona utatur; feriae servantur; alieno manum absteineat.*

Germanic. The Gothic exhibits the wish use in such expressions as, 'may God grant.' The potential use is also authenticated.

Balto-Slavic. Lithuanian shows the permissive use.

It is on the basis of the foregoing evidence that Delbrück and his adherents recognize the volitive and future uses as Indo-European functions of the subjunctive, and the wish and potential uses as Indo-European functions of the optative. In the main, I believe, the evidence warrants the conclusion drawn from it by Delbrück. Yet certain facts of usage in Sanskrit and Greek must not be ignored. In the earliest Sanskrit, on which Delbrück's conclusions as to that language mainly rest, the subjunctive is not restricted exclusively to the volitive and future uses; nor is the optative confined exclusively to wishes and potential functions. So also in Greek the subjunctive at times appears in wishes, while the pre-

scriptive optative is essentially volitive in character, as is also the optative in requests. Yet even in Sanskrit there is a decided preponderance of the functions recognized by Delbrück for the subjunctive and optative, while in Greek these functions are practically the rule. That two moods, representing functions so closely related as those of will and wish, should occasionally interchange, is hardly surprising. Such interchange would be but the manifestation of the tendency which in Latin led to the fusion of the subjunctive and optative, and in Sanskrit and Germanic resulted finally in the absorption of the subjunctive in the optative.

Whitney, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xiii, p. 294, in his review of Delbrück's *Altindische Syntax* (*Syntaxtische Forschungen*, v), refuses to accept Delbrück's doctrine that the fundamental distinction between the subjunctive and optative is the expression by the former of an action willed, by the latter of an action wished. "To this doctrine," he says, "I have never been able to give my assent, especially for these reasons: I do not find a sufficiently well-marked difference of sense of the kind asserted between the two modes, but only such a preponderance, on the whole, of the sense of wishing on the side of the optative as might easily come about by gradual differentiation of usage between two originally equivalent formations." But, as Delbrück observes in his *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 351, the question of the absolutely original values of the subjunctive and optative is not involved in his theories. He aims only to set forth the values attributable to these moods in the parent-speech as shown by the evidence of the separate languages. How these forces were developed, — whether by a process of selective differentiation or otherwise, is a topic he does not aim to discuss.

It remains to consider the other views which have been mentioned as to the force of the subjunctive and optative, along with the theories as to the relationship of the several functions of each mood. These views may be grouped under four heads:

1. The metaphysical theories of those who regard the subjunctive and optative as the moods of an act conditioned, or an act conceived, etc.
2. The views of those who refuse to attach to the subjunctive and optative any definite fundamental notion whatever.
3. The views of those who admit the existence of a fundamental

notion or notions in these moods, but differ in their conception of these meanings.

4. The theories as to the relationship to each other of the notions recognized in each mood.

The commonest form of the metaphysical theory of the subjunctive and optative is that which represents the Greek optative and Latin subjunctive as the mood of an idea, or of an act conceived. But that so abstract and highly sublimated a conception should have been fundamental with a primitive shepherd folk, seems incredible. Any such view is at variance with the well-attested fact that language develops from the concrete to the abstract, not from the abstract to the concrete. The view referred to is rather a product of an excessively metaphysical temperament, dominated by current philosophical theories and seeking to bring into accord with these theories all phenomena of history and life, including language. But the phenomena of language are not essentially logical; they are rather psychological and sociological. As such, they demand inductive methods of consideration, not *a priori* hypotheses. The setting up of a meaning for an inflected form as vague and indefinite as that of an act conceived, or "ein polemischer Modus" (Dittmar), seems therefore a serious error of method.

I pass to a consideration of the views of those who hold that inflected forms in general and the forms of the subjunctive and optative in particular possessed no definite meaning in Indo-European. These views are represented especially by Bergaigne and Morris. Bergaigne maintains that words did not originally designate precise concepts. In support of this he declares that children at play have been known to allow one and the same word to do duty as the designation of many totally different objects. He assumes that the same practice characterized primitive speech, and that words started with a very vague meaning, developing definiteness with time. But it is extremely doubtful whether the psychology of the child is identical with that of the mature intellects of even primitive people. Nor is it clear that the circumstance he cites from child life represents more than an isolated vagary. Bergaigne also attaches too much importance to the fact that exceptions to precision of use of the subjunctive and optative occur in early Sanskrit.

Morris, while attaching a slightly more definite conception to the subjunctive and optative, refuses to admit that they possessed any "Grundbegriff." The vague meaning of desire which he attaches to both moods he conceives to have developed (by the various factors already enumerated) to the functions we observe in the history of the different Indo-European languages. But it is impossible to understand how so vague a value as attached by either Bergaigne or Morris to the subjunctive and optative in Indo-European could have developed with such surprising uniformity in the different languages. Nothing but the assumption of distinct functions in Indo-European will account for the presence in the separate languages of substantially the same functions in the employment of subjunctive and optative.

Coming to the question of what meanings shall be recognized as fundamental for the two moods, we find to-day (on the part of those who believe in a "Grundbegriff") a wide — almost a general — recognition of the Indo-European character of the functions attributed by Delbrück to the subjunctive and optative. Such recognition is accorded, for example, by Brugmann, Stahl, Hale, Goodwin, and many others. Brugmann goes further than Delbrück in the case of the subjunctive, and recognizes the deliberative use as Indo-European. Of the correctness of this there can hardly be any doubt. The only question is whether the deliberative use should be accorded independent recognition, or merely be regarded as a sub-type of the volitive. The chief dissent from Delbrück on the general question of what "Grundbegriffe" should be recognized, comes from Mutzbauer and Lattmann. Mutzbauer agrees with Delbrück in part, viz. as regards the optative. As to the subjunctive he dissents, holding that mood to be the mood of "Erwartung" or expectancy. This conception is in accord with Delbrück for a part of the subjunctive uses, viz. those designated by Delbrück as pure future. But when Mutzbauer attempts to bring under the same head such expressions as Δ 13, ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθα; A 62, ἀλλ' ἄγε τίνα μάντιν ἐρείομεν; A 26, μή σε γέρον κηλείω; B 435, μηκέτι αἶθι λεγώμεθα, he seems guilty of forcing the interpretation to support a theory. I hold it impossible to refute the existence in large numbers in the Homeric poems of subjunctive uses in which the mere conception of "Erwartung" fails to do justice to the modal force.

Lattmann's position is more radical. He disputes Delbrück's conclusions, in part, as to both moods. While recognizing the volitive use of the subjunctive, he rejects the future use. To him the subjunctive is partly volitive (imperative), partly potential. The optative, he holds, is employed partly in wishes, partly in a so-called "fictive" use. This latter is in no wise different from the conception of the optative as the "Modus der Vorstellung." The serious objections to such a conception have already been set forth in connection with our consideration of the metaphysical theories of the moods, and need not be repeated here. Lattmann's conception of one phase of the subjunctive as potential, however, demands a word of comment. In support of his position, Lattmann gives no adequate material. He cites Z 459, *καί ποτέ τις εἴπησιν*, with the implication that this represents a frequent and typical usage. But such is not the case, and this particular example, of which he makes much, is by most interpreters taken as an illustration of the pure future use; cf. Latin *aliquis dicet*. Lattmann takes no account of the multitude of Homeric subjunctives where the force is a pure future and nothing else. The common potential function seen in the Greek optative Lattmann does not recognize as potential. Instead, he brings it under his "fictive," a conception so broad and vague as to be capable of including almost anything, including infinitives, gerunds, and even the uses of the future and future perfect indicative, did one wish to do so.

Coming to the mutual relationship of the functions of each mood, we find ourselves on very difficult ground. Delbrück's views on this point cannot be said to have met with general acceptance, even on the part of those who accept his conclusions as to the values to be attached to the subjunctive and optative. Brugmann's attitude is that the different functions were, in the case of the subjunctive, very likely originally unrelated, owing to the variety of subjunctive formation. In the case of the optative, while there is no such variety of formation, he nevertheless hesitates to commit himself positively in favor of any theory of relationship of the wish and potential functions. Goodwin's position has already been stated. He holds that the future meaning was original with the subjunctive, and that the volitive meaning developed from that. So in the case of the opta-

tive, he starts with the remote future (potential) notion, and regards the wish notion as an outgrowth of that. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums*, p. 234 ff., accepts Delbrück's views as to the relation of the functions of each mood, and supports them by the following arguments:

Subjunctive. In favor of the development of the future function of the subjunctive from the volitive, Stahl, arguing for Greek, urges:

1. The volitive force is the permanent one, while after Homer the future force disappears in independent sentences.

2. The volitive function does not depend upon any reënforcing particles, while in the case of the future use in Homer we find *κέν*, *ἄν* associated with the subjunctive.

3. That the future force of the subjunctive was not fundamental and original, is shown by the fact that a special form for the future developed. Had the future force been original with the subjunctive, a separate form for the future indicative would have been superfluous.

4. Had the future meaning been original, it is not easy to see how the volitive, developing from this, would have restricted itself to the first person (as it does in affirmative sentences), for in the future use in Homer we find all persons.

5. Remnants of present indicatives in Homer employed as futures point to a time when the volitive use had not yet developed a future force.

6. In the case of the future indicative we find at times a secondary volitive force. It is quite in harmony with that to assume that the subjunctive (originally volitive) secondarily developed a future force.

7. The development of the volitive meaning to the future is supported by analogous phenomena in other languages; e.g. in modern Greek the future is regularly formed by the auxiliary *θέλω*; in English it is formed by the auxiliary 'will.'

Optative. In favor of the development of the potential¹ meaning from that of wishing, Stahl urges:

¹ It is greatly to be regretted that Stahl employs the designation "Optativ der Vorstellung" for the potential uses. However, his examples show that he does not use the term in the objectionable sense discussed above (p. 147), but only to cover potential functions.

1. The other functions of the optative are easily referred to the use in wishes for their origin.

2. In Homer the potential optative regularly takes the particles *κέν, ἄν*, while in the wish use no particle is necessary. This would hardly be the case, had the potential meaning been original.

3. That the wish meaning of the optative is original, is supported by the analogy of the subjunctive.

Brugmann, Lattmann, and others cite the German *möge er kommen*, etc., in support of the theory that the wish meaning of the optative developed from the potential. But in *möge er kommen*, it is the subjunctive form *möge* that conveys the notion of wishing, — ‘may he be able.’ Did the German use *er mag kommen* in the sense of ‘may he come,’ there might be some force in the argument that a development from the potential meaning to the wish meaning was possible and natural.

It remains to consider briefly the theory of Kruezkiewickz, who maintains that the subjunctive was primarily the mood of subordination. In support of this thesis, Kruezkiewickz urges the circumstance (for Latin) that the Latin grammarians not only designate the subjunctive as *modus subiunctivus*, but define it as the ‘mood of subordination.’ As regards the designation, the Roman grammarians, of course, were slavishly following the nomenclature of the Greeks. As regards the definition, it should be noted that those grammarians who define the subjunctive as the mood of subordination recognize also a *iussivus*, a *concessivus*, and an *optativus*, designations clearly intended to cover the independent uses of the subjunctive. But quite apart from these considerations, the assumption that the Roman grammarians were in the least qualified to pass intelligently upon the fundamental force of an inflected form, must be regarded as naïve. Kruezkiewickz’s conclusions are based upon the theory that the principal clause is younger than the subordinate, — a theory which contradicts all accepted views of the history of language; while his methods of deriving the independent uses of the Latin subjunctive from subordinate uses are highly arbitrary and fantastic.

My own position is this: I agree with Delbrück in his recognition of fundamental uses; volitive and future for the Indo-European subjunctive; wishing and potential for the Indo-European optative.

These potential uses are the 'may' and 'should'-'would' potentials. To them jointly I have elsewhere given the name of 'contingent futurity,' a designation which I shall employ also in my subsequent discussion of the potential uses of the Latin subjunctive. The Deliberative I regard with Brugmann as also Indo-European, but I consider it a volitive development and shall treat it as such.

As regards the relationship of the volitive and future forces of the subjunctive, and of the wish and potential forces of the optative, I do not feel the same positiveness of conviction. The position of Delbrück seems to me plausible, and the arguments adduced in its support by Stahl and others are weighty, but to my mind not sufficiently so to be regarded as final. The question of relationship is, after all, of secondary importance. Whatever the facts of relationship,—whether the volitive and true optative are the origin of the future and potential uses, or *vice versa*, or whether there is no relationship between the two uses of each mood,—the important question is as to the existence of the uses themselves and as to their Indo-European character. In this matter I believe Delbrück stands on firm ground.

CLASSIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT USES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

VOLITIVE USES.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF DETERMINED RESOLUTION.¹

In the first person singular of the present subjunctive the volitive force appears in a few instances:² *Bacch.* 1058, *taceam*; *Men.* 983, *metum id mihi adhibeam*, *culpam abstinenceam*; *Most.* 849, *videam*; *H. T.* 273, *mane: hoc quod coepi primum enarrem*.

In two instances the volitive force is so weakened that the subjunctive expresses merely a proposal (*Hale-Buck*, 501, 2). Thus:

¹ Cf. *Hale-Buck*, *Latin Grammar*, 501, 1; *Riemann*, *Syntaxe Latine*, § 165, b, *Rem.*; *Blase*, *Historische Grammatik der lat. Spr.* iii, 1, p. 113; *Morris*, *Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus*, *Am. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 134 ff.; *Lindsay*, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 64.

² Cf. *Sanskrit*, *brahmacārya āsāni*, 'I am resolved to become a disciple of Brahma,' cited by *Delbrück*, *Conjunctiv und Optativ im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, p. 18.

Trin. 748, vide si hoc utile deputas: ipsum adeam, edoceam; 1136, sed maneam, opinor; Phor. 140, ad precatorem adeam, credo.

In many cases the form is ambiguous, though analogy suggests that we have the subjunctive. Thus Cure. 160, mane: suffundam aquolam; Most. 1090, mane: experiar, ut opinor; Stat. 90, mane: coepiam, are all strikingly similar to H. T. 273 above cited. But inasmuch as the first person singular of the future was always the prevailing method of expressing the speaker's will, it is quite probable that these ambiguous examples may all be futures.¹ Blase (Hist. Lat. Gram. iii, 1, p. 113) brings under this head all cases with *certumst* and *potius*, e.g. Amph. 1048, certumst intro rumpam; Poen. 922, uni potius intus ero odio, quam hic sim vobis omnibus. But these are better regarded as subordinate. See below, p. 236; 244.

In Am. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 313 ff., and in Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vi, p. 217 ff., Elmer would see in the above examples that I have cited as subjunctives of determined resolution, potentials in which the 'should'-'would' notion has developed into an 'ought' notion. But the reasons which he adduces in favor of this theory are not convincing.

Two of the above examples (Bacch. 1058; Most. 849) are possibly instances of self-exhortation, like Bacch. 1049, properem perdere (see below, p. 167).

THE JUSSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.²

The jussive subjunctive primarily gives expression to a command or order. Often the force is so weakened or modified as to convey simply a warning, admonition, or request. It is also employed in curses and in prescribing the terms of a compact. In the main it represents the utterance of one speaking with authority, real or assumed.

The jussive is used in the second and third persons singular and plural, though the plural forms — especially in the second person — are very rare. The present tense is the one usually employed; but in a few instances the perfect appears. Reënforcing particles, especially *ut* (*uti*), *modo*, *ut modo*, are frequently added.

¹ On the difficulty of distinguishing the mood in such cases, see Morris, l.c., p. 135 f.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 114.

² Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 146 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, 1, p. 125 ff.; 200 ff.

Just how far the material brought under this head goes back to the prescriptive optative (see p. 154), is, of course, impossible to determine. Delbrück would recognize an optative origin in such examples of the subjunctive as those in the contract in *Asin.* 756 ff.; also (with a negative) in passages like *Cato, Agr.* 83, *mulier ad rem divinam ne adsit*; 5, 3, *iniussu domini credat nemini*. See *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 386.

PRESENT JUSSIVE.

No Introductory Particle.

SECOND SINGULAR.

Examples: *Amph.* 819, *sumas*; *Asin.* 99, *iubeas*; *Bacch.* 417, *morem geras*; 990, *taceas*; *Capt.* 551, *procul recedas*; *Curc.* 270, *pacem petas*; *M. G.* 1101, *dicas*; *Poen.* 330, *adeas*; *M. G.* 807, *memineris*; *And.* 598, *quiescas*; *Hec.* 638, *accipias puerum*; *Ad.* 431, *morem geras*; *Cato, Agr.* 36, *spargas, irriges*; 61, 1, *ares*; *Frag.* (*Jord.*), p. 79, 7; *emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est*; *Lucil.* 394, *hominem habeas*; 712 a, *dicas*.

There are about one hundred other instances of the 2d singular jussive in Early Latin. As a rule the reference is to a definite second person.

THIRD SINGULAR.

Examples: *Amph.* 950, *gubernatorem arcessat*; *Asin.* 772, *abs ted accipiat*; *Aul.* 600, *properet persequi*; *Bacch.* 662, *ita animum habeat*; *Capt.* 63, *litis contrahat*; *M. G.* 1126, *abeat*; *Pers.* 68, *det in publicum*; *Poen.* 905, *eas adserat*; *Pseud.* 570, *det locum*; *Trin.* 765, *homo conducatur, exornetur*; *Truc.* 232, *tum amet*; *And.* 895, *dicat*; *H. T.* 722, *traducatur Bacchis*; *Eun.* 5, *existumet*; *Phor.* 677, *illis repudium renuntiet*; *Hec.* 502, *renumeret dotem, eat*; *Ad.* 77, *fateatur nescire*; *Cato, Agr.* 1, 3, *sub radice montis siet*; *in meridiem spectet*; 5, 1, *disciplina bona utatur*; 80, *encytum ad eundem modum facito, nisi calicem pertusum habeat*; cf. 82, where *nisi* connects imperatives, — *spaeritam sic facito, nisi sic fingito*; 87, *indat, addat*; *CIL*, i, 199, 29, *posidere liceat*.

There are about one hundred further examples in Early Latin of the 3d singular present in the jussive use.

SECOND PLURAL.

Examples of the second plural present in the jussive use are extremely rare. I have noted only the following: *Curc.* 632, *quae-ratis chlamydem unde pervenerit*; *M. G.* 1341, *bene, quaesio, inter vos dicatis*; *Enn. Ann.* 244, 2, *memoretis loqui me*; *Pacuv.* 188, *concorditatem conservetis*; *Afran.* 103, *meum concelebretris diem*; formula of *adrogatio* in *Gell.* v, 19, 9, *velitis, iubeatis*.

THIRD PLURAL.

Of this usage only about thirty instances are found in Early Latin. Examples: *Amph.* 389, *indutiae parumper fiant*; *Asin.* 759, *fores oclusae omnibus sint nisi tibi*; *Bacch.* 1133, *cogantur intro*; *Cas.* 744, *hisce abeant*; *Curc.* 298, *sese domi contineant, vitent infortunio*; *Pers.* 352, *eant maxumam malam crucem*; *Poen.* 24, *aes dent, domum abeant, vitent infortunio*; 32, *tacitae spectent, tacitae rideant, tin-nire temperent, domum conferant*; 746, *suspendant se*; *H. T.* 745, *eceferant*; *Hec.* 511, *inter se transigant*; *Trag. Incert.* 112, *ita parent se*; *Naev. Com.* 112, *linguis faveant atque adnutent*; *Cato, Agr.* 2, 5, *satis accipiantur*; 2, 6, *locentur*; 23, 1, *sarciantur*; *laventur, picen-tur*; *parentur, sarciantur, emantur, salliantur*; 31, 1, *parentur*; 57, *bibant*; 67, 1, 2, *habeant, curent, capiant*; 117, *contundantur, deici-antur*; 130, *perbibant*; 144, 5, *iurent*; 160, *teneant*; *Frag. (Jord.)*, p. 70, 1, *revortantur*; *CIL*, i, 199, 25, *vectigal dent*; 45, *ad nos adeant*.

Jussive with Introductory Particles.

The particles used are *ut (uti)*, *modo*, at times combined with *at*. Occasionally *modo ut* is found. *Ut* in this use is probably an indefinite adverb, corresponding in its force and semasiology to the indefinite adverb *qui*, 'somehow,' 'only,' 'just.' The three meanings of the adverb *qui* are well substantiated, viz.:

1. Relative, 'in which way,' 'as.'
2. Interrogative, 'how?'
3. Indefinite, 'somehow;' cf. *modo*, originally, 'in a way,' 'in some way,' 'somehow,' 'only.'

In case of the corresponding particle *ut*, we have:

1. Relative *ut*, 'in which way,' 'as.'
2. Interrogative *ut*, 'how?'

If, now, we recognize an indefinite *ut*, we get for *ut* the third of the three meanings attaching to *qui*. This value seems to occur also in *uti-nam*, and to be supported by the use of *qui* and *ut* interchangeably in connection with independent optatives; see below, p. 193. Others, however, e.g. Kienitz, Probst (Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik, ii, p. 148) refer the use of *ut* under discussion to an interrogative origin. But satisfactory explanations of the assumed process of development are not offered.

The material for Early Latin follows:¹ Bacch. 739, proin tu ab eo ut caveas tibi; Capt. 115, sed uti adserventur; Curc. 130, periisse ut te dicas; 257, operam ut det; Epid. 267, arbitretur uxor atque ut fidicinam ulciscare; Pers. 151, longe ab Athenis esse se gnatam autumet et ut adflea; Poen. 29, domi ut procurent; Stich. 106, sed utraque ut dicat; 113, ut omnibus os obturent; 711, modo nostra huc amica accedat; Trin. 347, bene si amico feceris, ne pigeat fecisse; ut potius pudeat, si non feceris;² And. 316, ut te arbitretur sibi paratum moechum; H. T. 470, per alium quemvis ut des, falli te sinas; 572, at certe ut hinc concedas; 1056, ut uxorem ducas; Eun. 339, ut nunties patri; Phor. 212, em, istuc serva; et verbum verbo, par pari ut respondeas; Hec. 78, uti tum dicas; Ad. 280, at ut omne reddat; 398, sic siet modo; 741, id arte ut corrigas; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, ut introeas et circumspicias; uti bonum caelum habeat; 2, 6, uti compareat, uti pareatur, uti veneant; uti imperet et relinquat; auctionem uti faciat; 21, 5, uti idem faber figat; 22, 1, librator uti statuatur; CIL, i, 199, 41, id uti facere liceat; 196, 23, haice uti exdeicatis.

I should put here also the three following examples, all of which are in the 1st singular: Pers. 542, videam modo mercimonium, 'just let me see the goods.' This is just as clearly an order as if it read, *monstres mihi modo mercimonium*. The other examples are: Pers. 575, modo uti sciam; And. 711, at tamen. : : quid ergo? : : ut ducam. All three of these passages are clear orders,³ — different on the one hand from the expressions of resolve above cited (p. 161), and

¹ See also Dahl, Die lateinische Partikel VT, 1882, p. 293 f.; Schnoor, Der Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus, 1885, p. 1 ff.

² Leo and Lindsay indicate by their punctuation that they take the *ut*-clause here as dependent. The Götz-Schöll punctuation is decidedly to be preferred. Cf. Morris on Capt. 115.

³ Cf. Homer, A, 26, μή σε κίχρω, equivalent to 'don't be found!'

on the other from expressions of self-exhortation cited below (p. 167). Some may be inclined to see in the two Persa passages examples of provisos. But such an interpretation does violence to the sense.

Not a few scholars regard the foregoing examples as dependent upon some verb, such as *fac, vide, cura, volo, velim, opto*, etc., to be supplied in thought. So Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 293. Cf. Fairclough, on *And.* 712; Ashmore, on the Terentian passages cited above. But it is not easy to supply an ellipsis in these passages. It seems much more natural to see in them specimens of an early usage out of which, through parataxis, later hypotaxis developed.¹ Nevertheless it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line between independent and dependent uses. Nor is it necessary that this should be done in all cases. In admitting examples to a place in the preceding list, I have endeavored to be conservative, and have gone further than some scholars in excluding doubtful passages. Thus Morris, on *Capt.* 115, cites *Rud.* 1030, *aequid condicionis audes ferre? : : iam dudum fero, ut abeas, rudentem amittas.* This may possibly be independent. At the same time it may depend upon *condicionem* to be supplied in thought with *fero*.

THE PERFECT JUSSIVE.

The material is scanty: *Bacch.* 840, *quis igitur obsecrost? : : inveneris; ex me quidem numquam eris certior; Trin.* 1054, *vel illud perdas vel amicum amiseris; Ad.* 437, *de istoc viderit.* This last is quite commonly regarded as a future-perfect, e.g. by Dziatzko *ad loc.*; but the subjunctive is much more natural (so Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 184). *Enn. Trag.* 239, *prohibesseis scelus.*

So far as these instances indicate, there is no difference of force between the present and perfect subjunctive in the jussive use.

THE HORTATORY SUBJUNCTIVE.²

Under this head I bring 1st person plurals of the present subjunctive, like *faciamus*, 'let us make!' A single instance of the 1st singular will be discussed below. The regular negative of the hortatory subjunctive is *ne*, but I have noted but one instance of this in

¹ Cf. Schnoor, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

² See especially Morris, *Independent Subjunctive*, p. 155.

Early Latin. There is also one instance with *non*, and one introduced by the connecting negative *nec*. About one-half of the affirmative examples consist of *eamus*, *adeamus*, *abeamus*, or other compounds of *eo*.

FIRST PLURAL HORTATORY.

Affirmative.

Examples: Amph. 543, *eamus*; so Bacch. 105; Capt. 1027; Cas. 422; and frequently; Asin. 588, *auscultemus*; 731, *rem eloquamur*; Capt. 213, *concedamus*; Epid. 256, *reperiamus*; Men. 349, *videamus*; And. 171, *eamus*; so also H. T. 432; Eun. 377; and frequently; Eun. 442, *mittamus*; 609, *properemus*; Hec. 622, *accedamus*; 778, *experiamur*; Enn. Ann. 143, 5, *virtute experiamur*; Lucil. 166, *precemur*; 732, *surgamus*, *eamus*, *agamus*. There are some 115 other examples of this usage in Early Latin.

Negative.

Poen. 251, *ne eloquamur*; Scipio, in Gell. iv, 18, 3 (Or. Frag. ed. Meyer, p. 110), *non igitur simus ingrati*; Enn. Ann. 143, 2, *nec cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes, ferro non auro vitam cernamus*. The last two examples illustrate the freedom which prevailed in the employment of negatives with volitive expressions. While *ne* (*neve*) were volitive negatives, yet *non* and *neque* were always possible at every period of the language. See below under the Prohibitive.

FIRST SINGULAR HORTATORY.

Here belongs Bacch. 1049, *quod perdundumst properem perdere*. This is properly a self-exhortation. It corresponds exactly to Eun. 609, *properemus*.

THE PROHIBITIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.¹

The prohibitive subjunctive covers independent sentences introduced by *ne* expressing a prohibition. Both the present and perfect tenses are employed in this use. For the difference in their force, see below. Prohibitions may be in either the second or third person,² and either singular or plural, though in the perfect tense any-

¹ Schmerl, *Der Prohibitiv bei Plautus*, 1886.

² Some scholars, e.g. Kühner, *Ausf. Gramm.* ii, p. 141 ff., and Elmer, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xv, p. 132 ff., have restricted the application of the term "prohibitive" to the 2d person. But this has no advantages, and involves the separation of clearly related material.

thing except the 2d singular is rare. In Early Latin I have noted only two instances of the 3d person singular perfect, and only two of the 2d person plural. The 3d person plural of the perfect apparently does not occur at all.

While the negative of the prohibitive is normally *ne* (*ne quis, ne ullus, ne umquam*, etc.), yet we find with both present and perfect a number of prohibitives introduced by *non, nullus, nemo, numquam*. In a few cases we find *ni* taking the place of *ne* as introductory particle.

The connecting negative with the prohibitive is normally *neque* (*nec*). *Neve* (*neu*), ordinarily regarded as the normal connecting negative with the prohibitive, is relatively much less frequent. See the detailed statistics below.

In the following citations I have aimed to include only those subjunctives which are clearly independent. Thus most instances of *ne erres, ne censeas, ne frustra sis* seem to me dependent purpose clauses. Other clauses which certain scholars regard as independent, I take as substantive clauses. Expressions like Capt. 331 and Vid. 52, *ne duis*, I have brought under the category of the permissive use; see below, p. 175.

THE PRESENT PROHIBITIVE.

Second Singular with *ne*.

I give the material in full: Amph. 924, *irata ne sies*; Asin. 469, *molestus ne sis*; so also Men. 250; Most. 74; 601; 771; 877; 886 a; Pseud. 118; 889; Epid. 723, *ne attigas*; so also Bacch. 445; Truc. 276; Capt. 186, *ne postules*; so also Most. 613; 1023; Rud. 941; 1012; 1385; Capt. 349, *ne vereare*; 393, *istuc ne praecipias*; 957, *ne spem ponas*; Aul. 241, *ne doceas*; 173, *ne facias*; 341, *ne perdas*; Curc. 183, *ne occlamites*; 213, *ne rogites*; so also Merc. 165; Curc. 539, *ne facias aut censeas*; 565, *ne facias*; 568, *ne me territes*; so also 713; Epid. 145, *ne imbitas*; 304, *ne abitas*; Men. 327, *ne quo abeas*; 502, *odiosus ne sies*; Merc. 322, *ne ducas*; 401, *ne duas*; 528, *ne arbitrere*; M. G. 1215, *ne sis cupidus*; 1280, *ne illam excrucies*; 1361, *ne morere*; 1363, *ne me deseras*; 1422, *ne sis frustra*; 1423, *ne quid speres*; Most. 215, *ne suadeas*; 624, *ne censeas*; 745, *ne quid metuas*; 812, *ne videare*; Poen. 1373, *ne mirere*; Pseud. 275, *ne praedices*; Rud. 992, *ne feras*; Stich. 320, *ne cures*; Trin. 267, *ne*

fuas; 370, ne prohibeas; And. 205, ne facias; 789, ne attigas; H. T. 745, ne quaeras; 939, ne vereare; Eun. 76, ne te adffictes; 212, ne patiare; 273, ne sis; 388, ne conferas; 786, ne metuas; 988, ne spectes; Phor. 419, actum ne agas; Pac. 131, ne expectes; Turp. 106, ne attigas; Stat. 22, ne reare; Naev. Com. 5, ne dicas; Cist. 235, ne tu exponas; Enn. Sat. 481, ne expectes; Cato, Agr. 37, 3, ne tangas; 61, ne ares.

Most of the foregoing prohibitions are addressed to a definite 2d person. The last three examples along with Phor. 419 are general prohibitions.

Second Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ni*.

Epid. 339, ni quid tibi in spem ponas.

Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ne*.

Asin. 769, ad ne quem oculos adiciat; 762, ne epistula ulla sit in aedibus; 773, ne sapiat; 778, ne quoi anulum det; 779, talos ne quoi-quam admoveat; 780, ne dicat; 785, ne quid commoveat; 794, ne tussiat; 797, ne faciat; Poen. 17, ne quis sedeat; 37, ne palma detur quoi-quam; Pseud. 1267, ne quis me roget; H. T. 30, ne existumet; 361, ne quid titubet; Eun. 14, ne frustretur se aut sic cogitet; 529, molesta ne siet; 963, ne quam vim fieri sinat; Acc. 217, ne quisquam accumbat aut vescatur; Com. Incert. 30, ne pudeat; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, ne siet; so also 5, 2 (bis); 89; 143; 161, 4; 5, 2, ne sinat; ne quo eat; ne algeat; ne esuriat; ne censeat; 5, 3, ne faciat; 5, 4, ne quem habeat; ne quid velit; ne defrudet; ne habeat, ne quid velit; 66, 1, ne utatur; 83, ne adsit; 144, 4, ne quis concedat; 150, 2, ne promittat; 157, 12, ne cenet; Lucil. 797, ne sciat.

Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ni*.

Cato, Agr. 143, rem divinam ni faciat; CIL, i, 198, 39, ioudex nei quis disputet; 199, 6, is ager vectigal nei sit; 40, ni quis siet.

Second Plural Present Prohibitive.

Amph. 87, ne miremini; so Bacch. 1072; 116, ne admiremini; Bacch. 758, ne quoquam exurgatis; Capt. 58, ne vereamini; Cist. 782, ne expectetis; so Cas. 64; Pseud. 1234; Trin. 16; Truc. 482; M. G. 1378, ne me moneatis; Most. 468, ne attigatis; Pers. 93, ne detis; And. 980, ne expectetis; so also Ad. 22; CIL, i, 34, 7, ne quairatis.

Third Plural Present Prohibitive.

Poen. 23, ne obsideant; Eun. 183, ne fiant; Cato, Agr. 67, 1, ne caedant.

Present Prohibitive Introduced by *numquam*, *nemo*, *nullus*, *non*, etc.

numquam: Amph. 672, numquam creduis.

nemo: Asin. 756, intro mittat neminem; 768, vocet neminem; Liv. And. Trag. 8, nemo haec ruminetur; Enn. Epigramm. 509, nemo me dacrumis decoret; Cato, Agr. 5, 3, credat nemini.

non: And. 787, non credas (*credes*, DP); Plaut. Frag. 147, non hoc pulveret.

ne . . . quidem: Hec. 342, ne mittas quidem quemquam.

Present Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives (*neve*, *neu*, *nive*; *neque*, *nec*).

neve, **neu**: Most. 403, (cave siveris) neu quisquam responset; Poen. 18, (ne quis sedeat) neu muttiant, neu obambulet, neu ducat; 29, neu adferat; 38, (ne palma detur) neve (*nive* C) extrudantur; Truc. 787, divorsae state, neve inter vos significetis; Cato, Agr. 5, 4, (ne quid velit) neu velit; 83, (ne adsit) neve videat; 143, 1, (rem divinam ni faciat) neve mandet; ibid. (quam minimum utatur) neve domum recipiat; ad cenam ne quo eat neve ambulator siet; CIL, i, 199, 40, (ni quis sicut) nive pascat nive fruatur.

neque, **nec**: Amph. 985, nec quisquam, tam audax fuat; Asin. 775, (suspiciones segreget) neque pedem premat; 777, neque det manum; 778, spectandum ne quoi anulum det neque roget; 784, (tibi dicat) neque nutet; 792, (ne quid commoveat, 785) neque faciat neque sciat; 799, (ne faciat) nec accedat nec dicat; 854, neque divini neque humani quicquam accreduas; Bacch. 476, ipse neque amat nec tu creduas; Capt. 605, neque creduis; Men. 221, neque defiat neque supersit; And. 205, (ne facias) neque tu haud¹ dicas; Eun. 77, (ne te adflites) neque addas; 1080, (fatuos est) neque istum metuas; Naev. Com. 112, linguis faveant nec subserviant.

For a discussion of the significance of the use of negatives with the prohibitive, and for a different interpretation given by Elmer to passages introduced by *neque*, see below.

¹ *Haud* is here pleonastic. The Mss. here give either *hoc dicas* or *hoc dices*. *Haud dicas* is Donatus's reading.

THE PERFECT PROHIBITIVE.

As already noted, the perfect use is restricted almost entirely to the second singular.

With *ne*.

Asin. 839, *ne dixis*; *ne sic fueris*; Aul. 744, *ne istuc dixis*; Cist. 110, *ne quid quod illi doleat dixeris*; Curc. 599, *ne parasitum amiseris*; Epid. 148, *ne feceris*; so also Men. 415; M. G. 283, *ne dixis*; 1333, *ne interveneris*; Most. 1097, *ne occupassis*; 1115, *ne faxis*; Pers. 572, *ne parseris*; 793, *ne attigeris*; Poen. 553, *ne curassis*; 993, *ne parseris*; Pseud. 79, *ne parsis*; Rud. 1155, *ne ostenderis*; Trin. 704, *ne animum induxeris*; 1012, *ne destiteris currere*; Truc. 606, *ne responsis*; Phor. 742, *ne me appellassis*; Acc. 279, *ne attenderis*; Cato, Agr. 4, *ne siveris*; so also 113, 2; 37, 1, *ne indideris*; 45, 2, *ne feceris*; 93, *ne addideris*; so also 158, 2; 161, 2, *ne sarueris*.

The second plural appears in M. G. 862, *ne dixeritis*; the 3d singular in Phor. 554, *ne quid faxit*.

Perfect Prohibitive Introduced by *nullus*, *numquam*, *nil*, *nemo*, etc.

nullus: Hec. 79, *nullus dixeris*.

numquam: Capt. 149, *numquam istuc dixis*; fetial formula in Livy, i, 32, 7, *numquam siris*.

nil: Curc. 384, *nil me monueris*; M. G. 1007, *nihil amassis*; Most. 526, *nil me curassis*; so also Pseud. 232.

nemo: Cato, Agr. 5, 3, *dederit nemini*.

minime: Most. 272, *minime feceris*.

Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 166, notes that 2d singulars in *-sis* occur only in the prohibitive use.

Perfect Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives, *neve*, *neu*, *neque*, *nec*.

neve, neu: Merc. 401, (*ne duas*) *neu dixeris*; Pac. 200, *neu, quaeso, siris*.

neque, nec: Capt. 149, (*numquam dixis*) *neque animum induxis*; Rud. 1028, (*abi tacitus*) *nec me quoiquam indicassis*; Stich. 149, *neque ego te celabo nec tu me celassis*; Trin. 627, *noli avorsari neque te occultassis*; And. 392, *nec minueris*; H. T. 975, (*ne te*

admisce) nec tu aram nec precatorem pararis; Lucil. 775, neque barbam inniseris istam; Enn. Epigramm. 509, (nemo me dacrums decoret) nec funera fletu faxit; Ann. 143, (nec mi aurum posco) nec mi pretium dederitis. — *Et ne*: Cato, Agr. 113, 2.

On the Use of Negatives in the Prohibitive.¹

In all original volitive uses, the regular negative in Latin is *ne*. This is not an Indo-European inheritance. In Indo-European the negative was *nē*, which was also the regular particle with the subjunctive in its future use, as well as with the optative in all its functions (wishing, prescriptive, potential). There was, however, an Indo-European negative *mē*, which was peculiar to the so-called "injunctive." This injunctive consisted of forms which were outwardly identical with unaugmented praeterite indicatives. In function, this injunctive with its accompanying negative *mē* was equivalent to a negative imperative, or prohibitive. In Sanskrit we find these injunctives somewhat frequently with *mā* (= I. E. *mē*). But all subjunctives and optatives in Sanskrit regularly took *nā* (I. E. *nē*); i.e. Sanskrit maintained the Indo-European usage. In Greek, after the analogy of the injunctive with $\mu\eta$ (*mē*), the volitive subjunctive and likewise the wishing and prescriptive optative came to take $\mu\eta$, while the other subjunctive and optative uses (the pure future and the potential) abandoned *nē* for an entirely different particle, viz. *οὐ*.

In Latin, the injunctive particle *mē* gained no foothold. Instead, we have a new particle *nē*, as the regular negative of the imperative, the volitive, and the optative subjunctive. In a few cases we have *nī* (*nei*), which is employed with independent subjunctives and optatives (also imperatives) precisely like *nē*, though it is much less frequently used and is confined almost exclusively to the early period.

As regards connecting negatives, Early Latin shows both *neve* (*neu*) and *neque* (*nec*), but the latter is far commoner, occurring 26 times as against 10 instances of the former. Barring Poen. 29, *neve*

¹ Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 388 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 113 ff.; 152 ff.; 176 ff.; 232 ff.; Riemann et Goelzer, Grammaire Comparée, ii, p. 325 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 579 ff.; Schmalz, Lat. Syntax und Stilistik⁴, p. 480; Fowler, The Negatives of the Indo-European Languages, 1896; Elmer, Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 299 ff.

is used only when the preceding clause is prohibitive, and even then *neque* may be used (Seyffert, Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 63, p. 37). *Neque* with volitive and optative subjunctives is probably a survival of the Indo-European use of *ně* with the subjunctive and optative. At all events, with the perfect, the usage seems to have been Italic; for it occurs in Oscan, where *nep* (= *neque*) is repeatedly combined with the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions; see Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, § 313. *Neque* occurs also with the imperative, even in Early Latin, e.g. CIL, xi, 4766, *ne quis violatod neque exvehito neque exferto*.

In *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xv, p. 299 ff., Elmer denies the prohibitive character of all the above examples introduced by *neque* (*nec*), *nullus*, *nemo*, *nil*, *numquam*, assuming that *ne* was the only possible negative with the prohibitive subjunctive. But this attitude is quite unnecessary, and postulates too great uniformity of usage for language in general. The examples with *neque*, *nemo*, *nullus*, etc., Elmer regarded as "subjunctives of obligation and propriety," referring the idiom to a potential origin. But the possibility of such a development of meaning was not made clear, and Elmer's theory involved forced and unnatural interpretations for the passages included under it. For a detailed criticism of Elmer's position, see Bennett, *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, ix, p. 1 ff. A rejoinder was published by Elmer in *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xxi, p. 80 ff. But cf. Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, 1, p. 197.

On the Force of Tenses in the Prohibitive.¹

In the *American Journal of Philology*, xv, p. 132 ff., Elmer subjected to fresh criticism the force of tenses in the Latin prohibitive, and reached the conclusion that the old distinction drawn by Madvig would not hold. Madvig's theory was that in the second singular the perfect prohibitive was addressed to a definite second person, while the present was indefinite. Elmer showed that this theory will not hold for any period of the language or for any author. For Early Latin the proof was not necessary, as every play abounds in prohibitives addressed to a definite second person. In fact this represents the prevailing usage.

¹ See especially Elmer, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xv, p. 133 ff.; 299 ff.; Bennett, *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, ix, p. 48 ff.; Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, 1, p. 197; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 376 ff.

But the positive doctrine which Elmer endeavored to set up in place of the Madvigian view is quite as untenable. It was this: The present is used of ordinary prohibitions, the perfect where there is special emotion or excitement. Later (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxi, p. 84), this theory was modified somewhat, and the perfect was explained as the tense employed when "non-compliance with the prohibition would be shocking or disastrous." But the whole theory, as is obvious, is highly subjective, and has met with but slight favor. On the other hand it has met with much criticism, not only as a general doctrine, but as applied to authors and periods.¹ Elmer restricted the term 'prohibitive' to forms of the second person accompanied by *ne*, ruling out all third persons and all prohibitions with *neque*, *nīl*, *nemo*, *nullus*, *numquam*, etc. But even in this restricted application of the term he has not succeeded in establishing his doctrine.

Delbrück's theory (Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 375 ff.) is that the present prohibitive is durative ('durativ'), the perfect aoristic ('momentan'); i.e. the present represents the act as in process, while the perfect represents it without reference to continuance or completion. While this is in accord with the undoubtedly original force of the two tenses, yet I cannot agree with either Delbrück or Blase (Hist. Gramm. iii, p. 197) that the instances from Early Latin conform entirely to this principle. It is generally true that the perfect prohibitive preserves its original aoristic force; but many presents are also aoristic and do not emphasize the act as in process. Any one, with the above material, can easily make the test for himself.

DEVELOPMENTS OF THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

There are several very natural developments of the jussive and prohibitive. Thus a command may amount to an expression of consent or permission ('Permissive Subjunctive'), of easy acquiescence ('Subjunctive of Acquiescence'), or of defiance, etc.

THE PERMISSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

This occurs in both the present and perfect tenses, though sparingly in the latter. The force varies from pure permission to indifference. Where the indifference becomes extreme, the subjunctive

¹ Cf. Lebreton, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*, 1901, p. 294 ff.; Clement, *Classical Review*, xv, p. 157 ff.

sometimes expresses defiance (e.g. Bacch. 224, *veniat quando volt*; Hec. 634, *turbent porro quam velint*). The special force of the mood is often emphasized by the addition of a clause of proviso, or a relative clause with *libet*, by the presence of *vel*, *mea caussa*, or some such expression. See the examples. In a few instances we find negative permissives. The negative particle with these is *ne*.

THE PRESENT PERMISSIVE.

Affirmative.

Amph. 558, *proinde ut lubet quidque facias*; 644, *absit, dum modo domum recipiat se*; 928, *tibi habeas res tuas*; Bacch. 224, *veniat quando volt* (defiance); Capt. 693, *vel te interisse praedicent*; Cist. 493, *habeas*; Curc. 180, *dum abstineant, sibi quisque habeant*; Epid. 679, *dum sine me quaeras, quaeras mea caussa vel medio in mari*; Merc. 989, *sibi habeat*; so also Pers. 164; Rud. 1121; Merc. 991, *supplici sibi sumat quod volt*; Most. 46, *tu tibi istos habeas turtures*; 772, *inspiciat si libet*; Pers. 352, *ferant*; 373, *dicat quod quisque volt*; Rud. 727, *habeat, si argentum dabit*; 1165, *sit per me quidem*; 1369, *habeas tibi*; so also Stich. 615; Trin. 979, *dum ne sis quem nolo, sis mea caussa qui lubet*; Truc. 736, *discant, dum mihi liceat*; And. 889, *habeat, valeat, vivat*; 895, *age, dicat: sino*; H. T. 464, *faciat quid lubet*; Phor. 341, *tu rideas, prior bibas; prior decumbas*; Hec. 634, *turbent porro quam velint*; Ad. 134, *profundat, perdat, pereat*; *nil ad me attinet*; 622, *valeas, habeas*; 996, *sino: habeat*; Acc. 203, *oderint, dum metuant*; Naev. Com. 130, *dum videat, sciat*; Stat. 11, *mutuet mea caussa*; Afran. 120, *iactabit sese; iactet*; 408, *dum modo doleat aliquid, doleat quid lubet*.

Negative.

In the affirmative examples of the permissive subjunctive the force was, 'you may, if you want,' 'he may, for all I care,' etc. In the negative examples, the idea is, 'you needn't, unless you want,' etc. Examples: Asin. 460, *ne duit, si non volt*, 'he needn't give, unless he wishes;' Aul. 238, *ne duas*; 241, *novi*; *ne doceas*; Epid. 584, *ne fuat, si non volt*; Pers. 851, *ne sit*; Rud. 1367, *mihi triobolum ne duis*; Trin. 606, *nullus creduas*; Vid. 52, *ne duis*. — With connecting negative (*neque*), Vid. 51, *nec mihi nisi unum prandium quicquam duis*.

THE PERFECT PERMISSIVE.

Of the five instances I have noted, four are negative: Bacch. 90, *tu nullus adfueris, si non lubet*; Epid. 595, *ne fueris pater*; Rud. 1135, *nullum ostenderis*; And. 892, *viceris*, 'have your way';¹ Phor. 514, *unam horam ne oppertus sies*.

These examples show no noticeable difference of force between the present and perfect in the permissive use.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF COMPLIANCE.²

Closely related to the previous category, but logically distinct from it, is the subjunctive of compliance. For the most part it is confined to a few formulaic expressions, such as *fiat, mos tibi geratur*, etc.: Amph. 770, *fiat* ('very well'). The same expression occurs also, Asin. 40; Aul. 241; Capt. 213; 966; Cure. 673; Men. 544; Most. 803; 1038; Pseud. 559; Rud. 1037; 1042; 1337; 1417; 1423; Stich. 565; Truc. 962; Asin. 671, *fricentur*; Bacch. 537, *cena detur*, i.e. 'I'll agree to give you a dinner;' so also Truc. 127; cf. the familiar *cena tibi dabitur*; Pseud. 559, *geratur mos tibi*; so also Asin. 40; Truc. 961, *utrique mos geratur*; And. 956, *age fiat*; so also H. T. 790; 948; 1067; Eun. 100; 500; 614; Phor. 811; 1054; Hec. 358; Ad. 201; 521; 945; H. T. 743, *eatur*; 790, *quaeratur aliquid*; Eun. 1068, *audiamus*.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF UNFULFILLED PAST OBLIGATION.³

Just as the present jussive *dicat* means 'let him say,' 'he is to say,' so, by a perfectly natural extension, the past jussive came to mean, 'he ought to have said.' This may be made clearer by the following English illustration. If I wish a hackman to take me to the station at seven o'clock, I say to him, 'You are to come to-morrow at seven o'clock' (*venias cras septima hora*). When he fails to come, I reprove him for his negligence, saying, 'You were to come at seven,' i.e. 'You ought to have come at seven' (*venires septima hora*). The context indicates clearly enough that the past obligation was unfulfilled. We thus get a new idiom, which is of somewhat frequent

¹ Ordinarily taken as future perfect; so Fairclough and Ashmore, *ad loc.*; but see Sjögren, *Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, p. 155.

² Cf. Hale-Buck, *Latin Grammar*, § 531, 1.

³ Blase, *Hist. Gramm.* iii, 1, p. 152.

occurrence. In a few instances we have negative expressions of this kind. In accordance with their volitive origin, the negative in these is regularly *ne*, though *non* is found in one passage discussed below. In Cicero we find also the pluperfect tense in this idiom, — evidently an attempt to bring out with greater distinctness the reference to past time. But in Early Latin we find only the imperfect.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Merc. 633 (*quid ego facerem? :: quid tu faceres? men rogas?*) *requireres, rogitares*; 636, *ubi habitaret invenires*; 637, *exquireres*; M. G. 731, *vitam ei longinquam darent*; 732, *is adimerent animam cito*; Pers. 710, *cras ires potius, hodie hic cenares*; Poen. 387, *sic enim diceret*; 391, *ea memorares*; Pseud. 286, *invenires mutuom, ad danistam devenires, adderes faenusculum, surruperes patri*; 288, *surruperet patri?* Rud. 379, *adservaret, in custodia esset*; 842, *caperes fustem*; Truc. 748, *auferres domum*; And. 793, *praediceres*; H. T. 533, *aliquid reperiret, fingeret fallacias, atque servaret senem*; Phor. 297, *dotem daretis, quaereret alium virum*; 299, *sumeret aliunde*; 468, *illi consuleres*; Hec. 230, *curares*.

NEGATIVE.

Men. 611, *ne clam me comesses prandium*; Pseud. 437, *tu ne faceres tale*; Trin. 133, *non redderes, neque de illo quicquam neque emeret neque redderes neque faceres copiam*; Lucil. 498, *at enim dicis: 'neu muttires quicquam neu mysteria ecerres foras.'*

We should naturally have expected *ne* in the third example, and the connective *neve* (*neu*). But immediately preceding we have *non redderem?* a normal form of a past deliberative inquiry of duty or fitness (see below, p. 182). It is this *non redderem*, apparently, which has changed a normal *ne redderes* to *non redderes*, the speaker purposely following in his answer the form of the previous inquiry. With *non*, of course, *neque* (and not *neve*) naturally followed.

It is worthy of note that most of the instances of this idiom are in the second person. This is entirely natural, for the second person present (on which this idiom is modelled) must have been much commoner in daily speech than the third; and it is the positive frequency of a usage which naturally leads to its extension beyond its natural boundaries.

THE JUSSIVE AS PROTASIS.

I have noted few instances of this: Trin. 441, hic postulet frugis esse: nugas postulet; H. T. 643, melius peius, prosit obsit, nil vident, nisi quod lubet; Lucil. 371, visuri sint alieni viri, spiras pallam redimicula promit; Cato, Agr. 157, 4, in ea volnera teras brassicam; sanum faciet; 157, 14, in fistulam introeat; ea res sanum faciet. Pseud. 1015, argentum des, abducas mulierem, hardly seems to me to belong here.

THE PROHIBITIVE SUBJUNCTIVE IN INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

Here belongs Merc. 60, ne luberet vivere, which is simply *ne lubeat*, projected into the past.

THE CONCESSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

A natural development of the jussive and prohibitive uses is the concessive subjunctive, with the force, 'I grant that.' This is a fairly frequent idiom in the classical Latinity. In Early Latin I have noted only the following example, from Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 25, 4, sane sint superbi: quid id ad nos adinet?

THE "DELIBERATIVE" SUBJUNCTIVE.¹

Under this head are generally brought several classes of subjunctive uses which, though related in origin, are nevertheless logically very distinct from one another. Thus:

a) Bacch. 406, sequere: : quo sequar? 'where do you bid me, or advise me, to follow?'

b) Eun. 523, haec quor quaeritet? 'why should he ask this?' Epid. 588, non patrem te nominem? ('am I not to call you father?')

c) Bacch. 634, quid faciam? (soliloquizing, self-interrogatory), 'what course shall I pursue?'

d) Eun. 822, quid ego dicam misera? 'dear me! What can I say!' implying that the speaker is in a condition where the proposed action is hopelessly impossible.

These four types² are seldom differentiated. Usually they are all

¹ Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, 1904, p. 81 ff.; Morris, On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence, Am. Jour. Phil. x, 397 ff.; xi, 16 ff.; Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, 133 ff.

² Repudiating Questions are given separate treatment.

brought roughly under the one head of the "Deliberative." For convenience I shall designate them respectively as follows:

- a) Subjunctive of Inquiry after a Command or Advice.
- b) Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness.
- c) True Deliberatives.
- d) Subjunctive of Impossibility or Helplessness.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF INQUIRY AFTER A COMMAND¹ OR ADVICE.

This seems to be the original type of the four categories above mentioned, and is clearly of volitive origin, as may be seen from the fact that in many cases the inquiry after a command is preceded by an imperative or a jussive subjunctive. Examples: Aul. 638, pone hoc :: quid ponam? 651, redde huc :: quid reddam? Bacch. 44, id caveas :: quid caveam? 75, simulato :: utrum ioco adsimulem an serio? 406, sequere :: quo sequar? 731, scribe :: quid scribam? Further examples are: Aul. 644; Capt. 839; 843; Curc. 599; 721; Men. 618; Merc. 565; 749; M. G. 363; 459; Most. 513; 579; Poen. 357; Pseud. 1184; 1326; Rud. 938; Trin. 968; 981; Truc. 789; H. T. 585, quid faciam? :: iube hunc abire :: quo ego abeam? Phor. 540; Hec. 715.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

The previous section has dealt with the subjunctive of inquiry after a command. A new logical category arises when the inquiry after a command implies by the tone or mental attitude of the speaker that he recognizes the superior authority, wisdom, or judgment of the person addressed and wishes to follow his directions. 'What do you tell me to do?' then becomes 'What should I do?' 'What ought I to do?' In a number of instances we have a preceding imperative, just as in the case of the previous category, e.g. Amph. 783, exsolve cistulam :: quid ego istam exsolvam? M. G. 318, non iubes? (= *iube*) :: quam ob rem iubeam? Pseud. 1294, i in malam crucem :: cur ego adfieter? Many of these questions are, of course, purely rhetorical, — the inquiry, 'Ought I to do this?' 'Am I to do this?' often implying, 'I ought not to do this.'

In accordance with their origin, these questions of duty and fitness

¹ Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, 1891, p. 8; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288.

are usually in the first person, for they arise from inquiries after a command. Such commands are commonly in the second person; hence the inquiry is naturally in the first. The second and third persons, however, are occasionally found. The second person in the few instances in which it occurs does not differ logically from the first. In the third person the meaning often is: 'Is it right that he should do' or 'be?' 'Is it natural that he should do' or 'be?' e.g. H. T. 129, *mea solius solliciti sint causa?* *ancillae tot me vestiant?* 'Is it right that they should be bothered?' M. G. 925, *qui noverit me?* 'How is he likely to know me?' Pers. 636, *quae (patria) mihi sit, nisi haec?* 'What is it natural' or 'likely to be except this?'

The question may be introduced by the usual interrogative pronouns and adverbs (*quis, quid, cur, quam ob rem, ubi, quo, qui, unde*), by *utrum, an, -ne*, or there may be no introductory particle at all.

While the idiom originated in the present tense, yet it was also extended to the imperfect; see the examples below.

Negative questions of duty or fitness are also frequent. They present a variety of formal types, which will be considered in their proper place.

In a number of instances it is difficult to decide whether a given form is to be regarded as present subjunctive or future indicative, for the future indicative may be used with the same logical force as the subjunctive of duty or fitness.

Whether some of the examples brought under this head are not to be referred to a potential origin, is a question that has been often raised. Delbrück (*Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 389), Elmer (*Amer. Jour. Phil.* xv, p. 299 ff.; *Cornell Studies*, vi, p. 213 ff.), along with several earlier scholars, answer this question in the affirmative, particularly for certain types of negative questions of duty or fitness. Elmer's view will be considered below. So far as affirmative questions of duty or fitness are concerned, the potential origin is possible for only a small fraction of the material in Early Latin; it is not necessary for any of it. *Asin.* 724, *quid exoptem?* *Stich.* 294, *an vero nugae censeas?* *And.* 529, *quid malim?* 962, *quem potissimum optem?* *Phor.* 827, *ubinam invenire possim?* represent about all the questions of this kind in Early Latin where a potential character

could be easily defended. But if these are questions of duty and fitness, it seems much more probable that they are developments — extreme perhaps — of the volitive use.

AFFIRMATIVE QUESTIONS OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

Present Tense.

a) Introduced by Interrogative Pronouns or Adverbs: Amph. 41, quid ego memorem? Asin. 47, cur quaeram aut cur miniter? 267, ubi Libanum requiram? 716, quem te nominem? Aul. 713, quo curram? Capt. 739, cur postulem? Most. 581, quid ego recursem aut operam sumam aut conteram? Pers. 531, quam ob rem argentum enumerem? Poen. 386, quo modo orem? Pseud. 966, unde dicam? And. 343, ubi quaeram? quo intendam? 499, quid credas? H. T. 32, quor insano serviat? Eun. 523, haec quor quaeritet? Phor. 534, unde argentum inveniam? 1022, qui sperem? Enn. Trag. 298, quemnam te esse dicam? Acc. 295, cur pigrem aut dubitem? Turp. 120, quid te appellem? Gracchus (Meyer), p. 239, quo me conferam? quo me veritam? Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 27, 6, ecquis me augurem capiat? I have noted 81 further examples of this use in Early Latin.

b) No Introductory Particle: Asin. 489, tu contumeliam facias? 'are you to indulge in abuse?' 838, putem? Bacch. 903, exigam aurum? Pers. 26, cum eis belligerem? Stich. 297, nunc ultro deportem? H. T. 414, celem gaudium? Phor. 186, taceam? purgem me? 813, illa maneat? 973, venias nunc precibus? Cf. also H. T. 129, cited above, p. 180.

c) Introduced by *utrum*, *an*, *-ne*: Pers. 26, eisne advorser? Stich. 294, an vero nugas censeas? Eun. 721, utrum praedicemne an taceam? Hec. 442, maneamne? Ad. 128, an ego audiam? 336, patiamurne an narremus? Acc. 488; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 27, 5; Hec. 849; 852. Merc. 128 may be fut. ind.

Imperfect Tense.

This is simply the present projected into the past: Merc. 633, quid ego facerem? :: (requireres); Rud. 379, quid faceret? :: (adservaret dies noctesque); H. T. 532, quid faceret? :: (aliquid reperiret, fingeret fallacias); Trin. 177, an ego paterer? 178, eius essetne ea pecunia? 'Was it fitting that the money should become his?' 957, mihi

concrederet, 'Was he likely to intrust it to me?' H. T. 202, quem ferret? 'Whom was he to be expected to put up with?' Eun. 604, an ego occasionem amitterem? 'Was I likely to let the chance pass?'

Perfect Tense.

Merc. 301, ausimne eloqui? The perfect here has aoristic force.

NEGATIVE QUESTIONS OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

In logical value these correspond in the main to the affirmative questions already considered. Both tenses occur, the present and imperfect. The negative is usually *ni*,¹ a volitive negative found with the prohibitive (see p. 169), in purpose clauses, and with other subjunctives of volitive origin. We should naturally expect *ne*, but *ni* is by origin quite as much volitive in character as *ne*. Less frequently than *ni*, we find *non*. This last usage is probably to be accounted for by the fact that with affirmative questions of duty and fitness the Roman mind had come in course of time to feel no longer their volitive character. They were conceived of simply as questions of duty and fitness,—no longer as inquiries after directions or instructions. Hence *non* came to be used. In the classical period, *non* has entirely usurped the place of the earlier volitive *ni*. This use of *non* as the regular negative in expressions of this sort in the classical period, and its occasional use also in the earlier period, led Elmer (Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 314 ff.; Cornell Studies, vi, 213 ff.) to deny their volitive origin and to endeavor to explain them as potential developments. But it is not easy to see how *cur non laeter*, for example, as a potential expression meaning, 'Why would I not rejoice (if so and so should happen)?' could come to mean, 'Why should (ought) I not rejoice?' The fact that English 'should' ('ought') has developed into the 'should' of contingent futurity ('I should think,' etc.) might support the same development for Latin; but it cannot fairly be used as an argument in support of the *reverse* semasiological development, as Elmer seeks to employ it. Moreover his theory assumes absolute regularity of linguistic development and allows no scope for that inevitable

¹ This type corresponds, therefore, exactly to Greek deliberatives introduced by *μή*.

breaking away from strict schematic conformity which characterizes living speech. See Bennett, *Cornell Studies*, vi, p. 1 ff.

Besides *non* and *ni*, we find also various other negatives, e.g. *qui minus*, *quin*, *ne* . . . *quidem*, *nonne*, and *nil*.

Present Tense.

a) Introduced by *quid* . . . *ni* or *quid ni*: Amph. 434, *quid ego ni negem?* Cure. 423, *quid ni noverim?* 'Why am I not to be supposed to know?' So also M. G. 923; Men. 912, *quid ni sentiam?* M. G. 554, *quid ni (quid nunc, A) fateare?* 1120, *quid ego ni ita censeam?* 1311, *quid ego ni fleam?* So also Pseud. 96; 652, *quid ego ni teneam?* Stich. 333, *quid ni rogitem?* H. T. 529, *quid ego ni sciam?* Eun. 674, *quid ni habeam?* Ad. 573, *quid ni noverim?* 662, *quid illam ni abducat?* 726, *quid ni patiar?*

b) With *non*: Asin. 489, *tibi non dicatur?* Epid. 588, *non patrem te nominem?* And. 921, *non tu feras?* H. T. 583, *non accedam?* Hec. 341, *non visam?* Lucil. 551, *non appellem?*

The foregoing examples have *non* alone. The following have *non* in combination with another particle: Aul. 713, *quo non curram?* M. G. 317, *cur non rogem?* Most. 209, *cur non eurem?* Cure. 10, *egon non feram?* Phor. 260, *egon illi non suscenseam?*

c) With *quin*. The only example of this category ordinarily reckoned here is M. G. 426, *quin rogem?* But with equal confidence I should recognize also the following: Eun. 811, *quin redeamus?* (taken as "deliberative" by Sjögren, *Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen*, p. 77); Phor. 1015, *sed ea quin sit ignoscenda?* Lucil. 336, *quin potius vitam degas quietam?* may also belong here.¹

d) With *qui minus*: Amph. 76, *qui minus eadem histrioni sit lex quae summo viro?* 986, *mihi qui minus liceat?* Merc. 825, *qui minus contentus sit?*

e) Other forms: Hec. 811, *nil aliud dicam?* Phor. 412, *an ne hoc quidem adipiscar?* Pacuv. 129, *nonne officium fungar volgi?*

Imperfect Tense.

Cure. 552, *nonne is crederem?* The use of *nonne* in questions of this type, if not absolutely unknown in the later language, is at all

¹ Morgan also, *Addresses and Essays*, p. 137 f., recognizes the Terentian and Lucilian passages as illustrating the deliberative with *quin*.

events exceedingly rare. Other examples: Trin. 133, non ego illi argentum redderem? Most. 454, cur non tangerem? Eun. 481, quid ni esset? Lucil. 463, quid nei illitteratum me diceret?

TRUE DELIBERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVES.¹

The number of subjunctives that can with accuracy be called deliberative is exceedingly small. Most of those subjunctives ordinarily designated as deliberative have nothing deliberative about them, but are more properly classified under the two preceding categories or under the following one. The only uses to which the term "deliberative" may fairly be applied are those in which the speaker is represented as actually deliberating with himself as to what course of action he shall pursue. Instances of this sort are few. As examples may be cited: Curc. 589, quid ego faciam? maneam an abeam? M. G. 305, quid ego nunc faciam? So also Merc. 712; Cist. 528, quid ego nunc agam? So Most. 662; Trin. 718; And. 846; Ad. 784; And. 639, sed quid agam? adeamne et expostulem? ingeram mala? H. T. 674, quid agam? aut quid comminiscar? Ad. 625, nunc quid faciam, Asin. 258, unde sumam? quem intervortam? quo hanc celocem conferam? Capt. 531, quid machiner? quid comminiscar? Cist. 641, utrum hac me feriam an ab laeva? And. 259, nunc quid primum exsequar? 468, quod remedium nunc inveniam? So Phor. 200; Eun. 46, quid igitur faciam? non eam? an me comparem . . . redeam? 966, quid faciam? quidve incipiam? dicam an non dicam? Ad. 625, dicam fratris esse hanc? Enn. Trag. 231, quo nunc me vortam? quod iter incipiam?

Most of these cases seem fairly certain illustrations of the usage under discussion. But I should not venture to add to the foregoing examples. Most of them, it will be noted, contain the particles *nunc* or *igitur*, both natural concomitants of a question of deliberation; or else we have a double question, an equally natural sign of deliberation. In one or two instances we have negative questions. With these the negative is *non*.

In origin these deliberatives are very closely related to the fore-

¹ See Dräger, Hist. Synt. i, § 148, who takes this usage as potential; Kühner, Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 2; Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, p. 5; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288.

going category of the subjunctive of duty and fitness. The question in the subjunctive of duty or fitness is addressed to some one else. In the true deliberatives it is addressed to oneself.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF IMPOSSIBILITY OR HELPLESSNESS.

The subjunctive of duty or fitness often develops by a perfectly natural process into a question or exclamation implying impossibility or helplessness; i.e. *quid faciam*, for example, from meaning, 'What should I do?' comes as a result of the context to mean, 'What *can* I do?' in the sense of, 'I can do nothing.' The usage occurs mainly in the present tense and in the 1st person, but instances of the imperfect and perfect occasionally occur. Sometimes too we find the 2d person. From the nature of the case there are no negative subjunctives of this type.

It is not always easy, as it is not necessary, to draw a sharp line of division between subjunctives of duty or fitness, on the one hand, and subjunctives of impossibility or helplessness, on the other. Doubtless interpreters would differ in their understanding of numerous passages. This, however, is of small significance. That in a large number of cases the notion of impossibility or helplessness has developed, is sufficiently obvious, and the extent of the material coming under this head amply justifies the recognition of the category. As typical cases may be cited the following:

Present Tense.

Amph. 155, *quid faciam*? So Merc. 207; Pers. 42. Often in the fuller form: *quid ego nunc faciam*? as Cas. 549; Curc. 555; Men. 963; Amph. 1046, *quid nunc agam*? So Aul. 274; Most. 378; Bacch. 630, *unde habeam*? Capt. 208, *quo fugiamus*? Rud. 204, *quam spem capessam*? 653, *quid illum porro praedicem*? Phor. 199, *quid agam*? So 728; Hec. 444; Ad. 789, *quid faciam*? *quid agam*? Eun. 610, *ubi mutem*? 822, *quid ego dicam misera*? Phor. 185, *quod remedium inveniam*? Ad. 256, *quid ego nunc te laudem*? 528, *quid dicam*? 614, *quo modo me expediam*? Enn. Trag. 75, *quid petam aut exsequar*? *quove auxilio freta sim*? 77, *quo accedam*? *quo applicem*? Turp. 196, *quid agam*?

The following are examples of the second person: H. T. 317, *quid*

illo facias? 642, quid agas? So Eun. 74; Ad. 433; Ad. 330, quid credas? quoi credas? 431, quid facias?

The three following examples seem also to belong here, though it is possible that they may be of potential origin: Asin. 506, ubi piem Pietatem? Pseud. 1095, unde ea sit mihi? And. 613, qua <auda>cia id facere audeam?

Imperfect Tense.

Here we have the natural projection of the present into the past, as in previous related categories: Merc. 884, quid ibi faceres? The Mss. have *qui tibi facer his* (facere vis, *B*); *faceres* is Lachmann's conjecture. And. 53, qui scire posses? Eun. 831, quid facerem? So Ad. 214; 691, qua resciscerem?

Perfect Tense.

This usage arises by an extension analogous to that already noted under the imperfect. The perfect here functions as a true present perfect: Amph. 748, ubi audiverim? 'Where am I to have heard it?' 'Where am I to be supposed to have heard it?' i.e. 'I can't have heard it.' Cas. 617, quid (quod, *Mss.*; quot, *Lindsay*) ego inique fecerim? 'What wrong can I ever have done?' i.e. 'I can never have done any such wrong.'

SUBJUNCTIVE IN REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.¹

In these the speaker repudiates with scorn or indignation some command or imputation, or expresses his disdain at some proposal of another person. The origin of these repudiating questions or exclamations is, I believe, to be found in passages like M. G. 496, vicine auscultat::ego auscultem tibi? The context shows that the inquiry is uttered with contempt. The subjunctive in such cases was the subjunctive of inquiry after a command, but the indignant attitude of the speaker develops a repudiating force. As a result of

¹ Kraz, Sogenannte unwillige oder missbilligende Frage, 1862; Müller, G., Ueber die sogenannten unwilligen oder misbilligenden Fragen, 1875; Schnoor, Zum Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus, 1885, p. 3; Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, 1891; Dahl, Lat. Partikel VT, 1882, p. 298 ff.; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288 ff.; Drüger, Hist. Synt. ii, § 526; Kühner, Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 2; Dittmar, Studien z. Lat. Moduslehre, 1897, p. 79 ff.

the frequency of such expressions, a new category was formed. As soon as it became firmly established, it naturally began to extend beyond its original limits, and as a result we find repudiating questions and exclamations where no vestige of an inquiry after a command is discernible or even conceivable, e.g. Capt. 207, *figitis fugam::nos fugiamus!* The idiom is even transferred to the past, e.g. Phor. 120, *ille daret illi!* Men. 678, *pallam quam tibi dedi mihi redde:: . . . mihi tu dederis pallam!*

Repudiating questions and exclamations may be used either with or without particles. The particles employed are *-ne, ut, -ne ut, utin.* Whether these particles are interrogative or merely strengthening, will be considered below.

Negative repudiating questions and exclamations also occur. The negative is regularly *non*. In a single instance we find *ni*. The connecting negative *neque* is also found once.

AFFIRMATIVE REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.

No Introductory Particle.

PRESENT TENSE.

Illustrations of origin: Aul. 81, *intus serva::ego intus servem!* Asin. 91, *me defraudato::defrudem te ego!* Bacch. 627, *non taces? (= tace)::taceam!* Curc. 553, *vale::quid! valeam!* Men. 1023, *med emittas manu::liberem te!* Most. 618, *iube obicere::iubeam!* 633, *dic te daturum::ego dicam dare!* Pseud. 1226, *Pseudolum mihi dedas::Pseudolum ego dedam tibi!* And. 649, *habeas::habeam!* 894, *audi::ego audiam!* Eun. 796, *Pamphilam huc redde::tibi illam reddat aut tu eam tangas!* Phor. 987, *non taces::taceam!* 1000, *narra::tibi narret!*

Uses modelled on the preceding type. In these there is no inquiry, after a command: Amph. 813, *vir ego tuos sim!* Asin. 482, *tibi supplicium detur!* Aul. 45, *tibi ego rationem reddam!* Bacch. 1176, *exores tu me!* Cas. 114, *tua illaec praeda sit! (est, P); 454, deosculere!* Most. 896, *tibi obtemperem!* Pseud. 486, *aps ted auferam!* Asin. 812; 814; Merc. 575; Pseud. 318; 626; Stich. 471; Trin. 515; And. 619, *tu rem restituas!* 900, *adducas!* 915, *hie vir sit bonus!* Hec. 524, *vir ego tuos sim!* Eun. 676; Hec. 589; 671; Ad. 938;

Enn. Trag. 195, Helene redeat, virgo pereat! tua reconcilietur uxor, mea necetur filia! 121, ego letum inimico deprecet! Afran. 161, pistori nubat!

IMPERFECT TENSE.

The instances of the imperfect all represent derived uses of the present projected into the past: And. 282, memor essem! Phor. 120, ille daret illi! 382, nossem! Ad. 396, sinerem illum!

PERFECT TENSE.

Of the three instances of the perfect tense in this use, one is aoristic and looks forward to the future, viz. Truc. 625, quid! manu vicerim! The other two refer to the past: Most. 1026 d, ille aedis emerit! Hec. 138, cum virgine una adulescens cubuerit, sese illa abstinere ut potuerit!

Introduced by *-ne*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Illustrations of origin: Asin. 91, me defrudato :: ten ego defrudem! 696, meum collum circumplecte :: ten complectatur! Cure. 119, salve :: egon salva sim! Pers. 186, da pignus :: egon dem pignus tecum! Pseud. 1315, onera :: egon istum onerem! 1327, mecum i (*de conj.*) :: egone eam! And. 383, die :: egon dicam! H. T. 1015, confitere :: egon confitear! Eun. 152, nil respondes? (= responde) :: egon quicquam tibi respondeam!

Uses modelled on the preceding type: Asin. 628, tun verberes! 669, ten osculetur! 700, ten ego veham! tun hoc feras! 810, egon haec patiar aut taceam! Aul. 756, tun habeas! 824, egon te emittam! Bacch. 1192; Cas. 111; Cure. 494; Epid. 518; 574; Men. 559; M. G. 686; 1276; Most. 301; Pers. 135; 295; Poen. 368; Pseud. 205 b; 290; Stich. 132; Truc. 276; 312; 775; 925; And. 270, egon istuc conari queam! 271, egon illam decipi sinam! 910, tun haec facias! 943, egon patiar! Eun. 191, egon quid velim! 808; Phor. 431; Hec. 852; Acc. 231, egone Argivom imperium attingam aut Pelopia digner domo! Stat. 221, egon vitam meam contendam cum tua! 232; Lucil. 752.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Trin. 961, *eine aurum crederem!* And. 584, *egon istuc facerem!*
Ad. 676, *advorsumne illum causam dicerem!*

PERFECT TENSE.

Amph. 818, *tun mecum fueris!* In this instance the reference is to the past. In the four following examples we have *ausim* used aoristically: Merc. 154, *egon ausim proloqui!* Most. 923, *egon te ausim fallere!* So 924; Poen. 149.

Whether *-ne* in the foregoing examples is the interrogative or asseverative particle, cannot be determined conclusively. Warren in Amer. Jour. Phil. ii, 50 ff., seems to have established the existence of an affirmative or asseverative *-ne*, and (p. 78f.) recognizes it in expressions of the sort under discussion. Dahl (Lat. Partikel VT, p. 299 ff.) does the same, urging as a reason the greater force thus lent to the repudiation. But we can hardly regard this as final. I regard the question as still open, therefore.

Introduced by *ut*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Amph. 694, *te ut deludam!* Bacch. 375, *ut celem patrem tua flagitia!* Most. 14, *comesse ut quisquam possit!* Pers. 132, *me ut quisquam norit!* Poen. 316, *ut quidem tu huius oculos tractes!* Trin. 750, *ut ego thesaurum indicem!* And. 618, *tibi ego ut credam!* H. T. 1050, *mea bona ut dem Bacchidi!* Phor. 669, *me ille ut inrideat!* Ad. 654, *virginem ut secum avehat!* This may be simply an echo of the previous purpose clause, in v. 653.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Enn. Trag. 227, *ut ego illi supplicarem!*

PERFECT TENSE.

Men. 683, *mihi tu ut dederis pallam!* Some take this as dependent on the following *numquam factum reperies*. But this is tame and quite unnecessary. Most. 1017, *mecum ut ille gesserit!* H. T. 954, *ut pater eiecerit!*

Ut in the foregoing examples is variously interpreted. Dahl (Lat.

Partikel VT, p. 301) confidently asserts that the *ut* here cannot be either the indefinite or the interrogative particle, and so proposes to explain expressions of this type as the result of ellipsis, supplying in sense *putasne fieri posse* or something of the sort. Morris, on the other hand ('Sentence Question,' Amer. Jour. Phil. xi, p. 176), says, "it is plain that *ut* is interrogative in these questions." Morris's view is the traditional, and probably, the prevailing one; yet I have never been able to accept it. Unless we abandon the volitive theory of these clauses, I am at a loss to see how *ut* can here be interrogative. And I cannot abandon the theory of their volitive origin in view of their logical and formal relationship to expressions like *ego intus servem! defrudem te ego!* It seems to me, therefore, much more probable that *ut* in these expressions is the indefinite, or strengthening, *ut*. I should therefore regard the *ut* in And. 618, *tibi ego ut credam!* as of precisely the same nature as in *mihi ut credas* ('Just believe me!'), i.e. in both cases as an asseverative or strengthening particle; cf. p. 165.

Introduced by *-ne ut*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Aul. 690, *egon ut mentiar!* Bacch. 375, *egone ut haec gestem clanculum!* 637, *egone ut putem!* 842, *meamne ut retineat mulierem!* Cure. 616, *mean ancilla libera ut sit!* Pseud. 516, *egone ut cavere nequeam!* Rud. 1244, *egone ut celem!* Trin. 378, *egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar!* Truc. 758, *egone ut haec mihi patiar fieri!* And. 263, *ein ego ut advorser!* H. T. 784, *egon ut ei despondeam!* Eun. 771, *hancine ego ut contumeliam accipiam!* Phor. 304, *egon illam ut patiar!* 955, *hicine ut tantum argentum auferat!* 992, *hicine ut tibi respondeat!* Acc. 427, *egone ut hosti me offeram!*

IMPERFECT TENSE.

M. G. 962, *egone ut auderem!*

Introduced by *utin*.

Present Tense: Merc. 576, *utine vomitum excutias mulieri!* Rud. 1063, *utine istic prius dicat!* Hec. 199, *utin omnes mulieres eadem studeant nolintque!*

Imperfect: Phor. 874, *utine haec ignoraret suom patrem!*

Perfect: Epid. 225, *utin impluvium induta fuerit!*

NEGATIVE REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.

The negative here is *non*, to be explained in the same way as in connection with the subjunctive of duty and fitness (p. 179). There is also a single instance of *nī*. The same introductory particles are employed as in affirmative repudiating questions, viz. *-ne, ut, -ne ut, utin*, but these particles are not necessary. The imperfect tense occurs as well as the present.

No introductory particle: Phor. 419, *ne agas :: non agam!* Eun. 798, *ego non tangam meam!* Poen. 352, *ego non (nunc, codd.) te curem!* Rud. 723, *mihi non liceat (licet, codd.) abducere!* Truc. 443, *ego isti non munus mittam!* Hec. 342, *non visas!*—Imperfect Tense: Eun. 591, *ego hoc homuncio non facerem!*

Introduced by *-ne*: Capt. 139, *ne fle :: egone illum non fleam!* *egone non defleam!* Titin. 81, *tibin ego non delicem!*

Introduced by *ut*: Poen. 429, *ut non ego te emittam manu!*

Introduced by *utine*: Hec. 66, *utine eximium neminem habeam!*

Introduced by *-ne ut*: Asin. 884, *egon ut non subripiam pallam atque ad te deferam!* Truc. 441, *egone illam ut non amem!* *egone illi ut non bene velim!*—Imperfect Tense: Bacch. 197, *egone ut non redderem!*

Negative *nī*: Pseud. 917, *quippe ego te nī contemnam!*

Connecting Negative: Hec. 199, *utin omnes mulieres eadem studeant nolintque neque quicquam reperias!*

OPTATIVE USES.¹

The optative is extensively used in Early Latin. All four tenses occur, though the imperfect and pluperfect are relatively rare. The usual negative is *ne*, but other negatives (*numquam* and *non*) occur in a few instances. As connecting negatives we find both *neve (neu)* and *neque (nec)*. The present and perfect are frequently reënforced by strengthening particles, especially *utinam, uti, qui*. A special use is that in asseverations. Here the optative is introduced by *ita* and is often followed by an *ut*-clause correlative with *ita*.

¹ Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Sprache, iii, p. 131; 154; 179 ff.; 232; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 385; 389; 398 f.; Dräger, Hist. Synt. i, p. 310 ff.; Kühner, Ausf. lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 4, 5; Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 133 ff.

PRESENT OPTATIVE.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Without Particles.

Under this head belong the bulk of all independent optatives found in Early Latin. The material is extensive, but falls chiefly under a few oft-recurring formulas, of which *di te ament*, *di te perdant*, *di faciant*, *di dent*, *salvos sis*, *valeat*, etc., are the types.

a) Type *di te* (*me*, *vos*, *illum*, etc.,) *perdant*: Aul. 645; 658; Capt. 868; 909; Cas. 275; 609; and in 20 other passages. — In the form *di te perduint*: Asin. 467; Cas. 642; Curc. 720; and in 8 other passages. — In the form *Iupiter te perdat*: Amph. 569; Curc. 622; and in 2 other passages. — *Iupiter te perduit*: Epid. 66; Poen. 739.

b) Type *salvos sis*: Aul. 182; Bacch. 456; 536; Epid. 548; 549; and in 16 other passages.

c) Type *di faciant*: Amph. 380; Aul. 545; 789; and in 11 other passages.

d) Type *di tibi dent*: Asin. 46; Epid. 6; M. G. 1038; and in 9 other passages. — The form *duint* occurs in this formula in Pseud. 936; Trin. 436; and in 3 other passages.

e) Type *di te ament*: Aul. 183; Bacch. 457; and in 14 other passages.

f) Type *di bene vortant*: Aul. 175; 257; and in 10 other passages.

g) Type *valeas*: Cas. 216; Pers. 224; and in 3 other passages.

h) Type *di te infelicit*: Cas. 246; Epid. 13; and in 4 other passages.

i) Expressions similar in general character to those already noticed, but not occurring with frequency, e.g. Aul. 546, *istuc sospitent*; Capt. 355, *di tibi omnia offerant*; so Ad. 978; Curc. 130, *male tibi di faciant*; so Phor. 394; Curc. 588, *male sit tibi*; Merc. 327, *bene sit tibi*; so Pseud. 714; Trin. 715, *bene eveniat*; Curc. 39, *male istis evenat*; H. T. 1038, *di istaec prohibeant*; so Hec. 207; Ad. 700, *di me oderint*; And. 761, *di te eradicent*; so H. T. 589. Other expressions of cursing occur at Aul. 776; Most. 192; 655; Pers. 831; of praying: Pseud. 121; Acc. Praetext. 36.

j) Apart from the foregoing, there are few instances of the construction. Examples are: Asin. 770, *caeca sit*; Amph. 392, *Mercu-*

rius Sosiae iratus siet; 935, propitius sit potius; Asin. 15, pariter nunc Mars adiuvet; M. G. 936, bene rem geras; Pers. 189, bona pax sit potius; 269, vapulet; Pseud. 934, Iupiter te mihi servet; Trin. 351, quod non habes habeas; cf. also Poen. 1002; 1409; Acc. 156.

k) In Poen. 860, quem ament igitur? we have an interrogative optative, 'Whom do you wish that they love?' Cf. 859.

Present Optative with Reënforcing Particles.

With particles the present optative has substantially the same use as without. We find several of the same oft-recurring formulas, notably *qui (ut, utinam) di te perdant*. But on the whole the construction is more flexible, and we find relatively a much greater proportion of non-formulaic expressions.

In a few cases where the optative is introduced by *utinam*, the present is used for the imperfect and expresses a regret at the non-reality of the idea involved.

a) Introduced by *qui*. This *qui* is the indefinite adverb. By origin it was probably an instrumental or ablative: hence the meaning, 'in some way,' 'just,' 'only.' Examples: Cas. 279, qui illum di perdant; so Rud. 1166; Trin. 923; 998; Men. 451, qui illum di omnes perduint; 933; Phor. 123.

b) Introduced by *ut*. For the force and origin of this particle, see p. 164. Examples: Aul. 785, ut illum di perduint; so Merc. 710; H. T. 810; Cas. 238, ut te Mercurius perdat; so Ad. 713; Plaut. Frag. 21, ut illum di perdant; so Pers. 298; Eun. 302; Phor. 687; Naev. Com. 19; Stat. 114, ut te di infelicit; Asin. 21, ut superstes uxor siet, atque ut pestem oppetas; Pers. 290; Poen. 912, valeas beneque ut tibi sit; Rud. 82, ut hostes diffidant sibi.

c) Introduced by *utinam*. Wishes introduced by *utinam* show an absence of the formulaic expressions so common in wishes introduced by *ut* and *qui*. Examples: Asin. 615, utinam sic efferamur; 840, utinam rideant; Epid. 196, utinam conveniam¹ Periphanem; Men. 1104; M. G. 1010, utinam potestas evenat; Most. 233; Pers. 289; Pseud. 108; Rud. 158; Trin. 618, utinam te rediisse salvom videam; And. 931, utinam id sit; Eun. 655, utinam sic sint; 1028, utinam

¹ Schmalz, Synt. u. Stil.³ p. 329, denies the use of the optative 1st sing. in Early Latin; but this and several following examples sufficiently attest the usage.

videam; Hec. 536, *utinam sciam*; Ad. 972; Enn. Trag. 170; Pacuv. 139; Acc. 167; Turpil. 125; 192; 207; Stat. 57.

In the following the present has the force of the imperfect: Asin. 418, *utinam stimulus mihi sit*; Eun. 210, *utinam possis*.

d) Introduced by *utinam modo*, *modo ut*: Aul. 433, *utinam mea modo auferam*; And. 409, *modo ut possim*; Phor. 712, *ut modo fiant*; 773, *modo ut possiet*.

Asseverative Use of the Present Optative.

A typical illustration of the asseverative use is Cas. 452, *ita me di ament, ut ego vix reprimo labra*. Numerous also are the instances in which the asseverative optative with *ita* is followed, not by an *ut*-clause, but by an independent indicative or subjunctive, as M. G. 501, *ita me di ament . . . dedecoris pleniorum erum faciam tuum* (512). In both types of usage the almost unvarying formula is: *ita me di ament* (*Venus amet, Iupiter amet*).

a) Type *ita . . . ut*: Aul. 445, *ita me amet Laverna uti te differam*; *uti* here is Götz's conjecture. Similarly Bacch. 111; 892; Capt. 878; Pers. 492; Pseud. 943; H. T. 686; Most. 182, *ita tu me ames, ita Philolaches tuos te amet, ut venusta's*; Poen. 1258, *med ita di servent, ut hic pater est voster*; Phor. 807. In the foregoing we have the present indicative in the *ut*-clause. The following examples show other forms: Curc. 208, *ita me Venus amet, ut ego numquam sinam*; Hec. 579, *ita me di ament itaque obtingant ut numquam commerui*; H. T. 1030, *ita mihi sis superstes, ut ex me natus es*; Poen. 289, *ita me di ament, ut malim*; Stich. 742, *ita me Venus amet, ut ego exissem*.

b) Type without *ut* in the second clause. Usually the second clause stands in the present indicative, e.g. Most. 170, *ita me di ament, lepidast*; Poen. 504; 1413; Stich. 685; And. 947; Eun. 474; 615; Phor. 165; Hec. 258; 276. In the following examples, *ita me di ament* is contained within the related clause or else follows it: H. T. 383, *minume, ita me di ament, miror*; Eun. 882, *te quoque iam, ita me di ament, amo*; Phor. 954; Hec. 206; 233; 642.

Other tenses of the indicative also occur in the second clause, e.g. (Imperfect), Amph. 597, *neque, ita me di ament, credebam*; (Future) Curc. 574, *ita me bene iuvent, iam ego te faciam*; Stich. 754; (Per-

fect) M. G. 725, *ita me di ament*, *aequom fuit*; 1403; Poen. 1325; H. T. 569; Eun. 1037; Phor. 883. Sometimes the *ita me di ament* is followed by a mere exclamation, as Pers. 639, *ita me di ament*, *sapienter!* Trin. 1024, — *graphicum furem!* Sometimes it occurs alone, without corresponding clause, as Hec. 864. The subjunctive follows in Poen. 827 and H. T. 953.

NEGATIVE PRESENT OPTATIVES.

Introduced by *ne*: Most. 307, *ne umquam quisquam invidet*; Trin. 351, *quod habes ne habeas*; Ad. 835, *ne modo nos tuos animus subvortat*.

Introduced by *non*, *numquam*: Bacch. 504, *mihi numquam quisquam creduat*; Cist. 555, *utinam non queas*; Truc. 306, *numquam mihi quisquam creduit*.

Connecting negatives. Here we find only *neque* (*nec*): Bacch. 847, *neque Bellona mi neque Mars creduat*; Pseud. 272, *neque ament neque faciant bene*; Enn. Trag. 363, *neque umquam extollas*. Cf. also Poen. 859, *di omnes ament—:: quemnam hominem?:: nec te nec me*.

PERFECT OPTATIVE.¹

AFFIRMATIVE.

Without Particles.

The material under this head is restricted almost exclusively to *s*-forms, and of these, *faxit*, *faxint* are by far the most frequent. They look forward to the future.

Faxit, *faxint*: Aul. 149, *ita di faxint*; so 257; 788; Capt. 172; and in 14 other instances.

Other verbs: Asin. 654, *di te servassint*; so Cas. 324; Pseud. 37; Trin. 384; Cist. 742, *servassit*; Pseud. 14, *prohibessit*; Plaut. Frag. 63, *mihi Laverna in furtis celebrassit manus*; Afran. 264, *di te mactassint malo*; Pacuv. 112, *di monerint meliora*, *amentiam averuncassint tuam*, quoted by Lucil. 466; Men. 295, *perieris*; Stich. 385, *perierint*.

¹ Cf. Lübbert, *Der Conjunktiv Perfecti und das Futurum Exactum im älteren Latein*, 1867, p. 30 ff.

With Particles.

Amph. 632, *utinam di faxint*; so also H. T. 161; Hec. 354; Aul. 50, *utinam me adaxint ad suspendium*; Cas. 398, *utinam sors deliquerit*; Poen. 799, *utinam abierit malam crucem*; Enn. Trag. 289, *qui illum di mactassint malo*; And. 463, *utinam hic surdus aut haec muta facta sit*; Ad. 507, *utinam hic sit modo defunctum*. In the preceding the reference is to the future. In the following example we have a true present perfect, H. T. 617, *ut satis contemplata sis*, 'may you have examined it enough,' i.e. 'I hope you have examined it sufficiently.'

Asseverative Uses of the Perfect Optative.

Capt. 622, *ita me faxit patriae compotem, ut Philocrates non est*; Curc. 577, *ita me amassint, ut non facio*; Stich. 505, *ita meas servassint filias, ut mihi volup est*.

NEGATIVE PERFECT OPTATIVES.

Bacch. 468, *ne di sirint*; so Merc. 323; 613; Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, 36; Rud. 790, *numquam hercle quisquam me lenonem dixerit, si te non ludos pessumos dimissero*. Connecting negative, Curc. 27, *nec me sirit (sinit, codd.) Iupiter*.

Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 166, notes that perfects in *-sit, -sint* are restricted almost exclusively to the optative function.

IMPERFECT OPTATIVE.

In the imperfect tense the optative expresses a regret at the non-existence of something, and is regularly accompanied by *utinam*. Usually the reference is to the present, but in two instances it is to the past. Examples: Amph. 575, *utinam ita essem*; Merc. 823, *utinam lex esset*; Rud. 533, *utinam uterer*. The other examples are Trin. 1028; And. 606; Eun. 91; 175; Ad. 453. Referring to the past: Capt. 537, *utinam te di prius perderent*; Rud. 494, *utinam prius in Sicilia perbiteres*.

A peculiar instance of the imperfect optative is found in Most. 183, *ita ego istam amarem*. This is simply an asseverative *ita ego istam amem* (cf. 182, *ita Philolaches te amet*) projected into the past.

No illustrations of the negative with the imperfect optative occur in Early Latin.

THE PLUPERFECT OPTATIVE.

Here *utinam* is invariably present. A number of negative uses occur.

Affirmative: Amph. 386, *utinam istuc pugni fecissent tui*; Rud. 497, *utinam cubuissem*; Truc. 375, *utinam rei parsisses*; Naev. Com. 43, *utinam nasum abstulisset*; Acc. 52, *utinam me mactasset*.

Negative: Enn. Trag. 205, *utinam ne accedisset trabes*; 241, *utinam ne umquam pedem extulisses*; Phor. 157, *utinam ne in mentem incidisset*. — Connecting negatives: Enn. Trag. 205, *utinam ne accedisset trabes neve coepisset*; Phor. 157, *utinam ne Phormioni in mentem incidisset neu me impulisset*.

POTENTIAL USES.¹

Potential uses fall into several categories. The commonest of these is that indicated by the English auxiliaries 'should,' 'would.' But there are also 'may' and 'can' potentials. These last two varieties, however, are much less frequent.

THE 'SHOULD'-'WOULD' POTENTIAL.

Under this head belong those uses in which the validity of the statement is represented as dependent upon some condition expressed or understood. When the condition is expressed, we get one of the regular types of conditional sentences. But there is really no difference in *putem*, for example, whether we say, *eum fidelem esse putem*, or *eum si laudes, fidelem esse putem*.

All four tenses of the subjunctive occur in this use, though the present is much the commonest.

PRESENT TENSE.

I have elsewhere² applied the designation 'Contingent Futurity' to the use now under consideration. The usage is Indo-European, and is probably the starting-point of the somewhat different uses of

¹ Kühner, *Ausf. Lat. Gramm.* ii, § 46; Dräger, *Hist. Synt.* i, § 148; Blase, *Hist. Gramm.* iii, p. 139 ff.; 155 ff.; 202 ff.; 226 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 387 ff.; 399; Morris, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 284 ff.; 384 ff.; Rodenbusch, *De temporum usu* Plautino, 1888, p. 57 ff.

² *Latin Language*, § 355; 360; *Critique of Subjunctive Theories*, Cornell Studies, ix, passim; see also above, p. 161.

the imperfect and pluperfect tenses. In a number of instances the contingency is so slight and so vague that the difference between subjunctive and indicative sinks to a minimum. Here belong particularly *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, as softened forms of statement for *volo*, *nolo*, *malo*; but a number of other typical uses of a similar sort also occur.

Examples: Amph. 985, *nec quisquam tam audax fuat*; 1060, *nec me miserior feminast neque ulla videatur magis*; Asin. 558, *qui possis collaudare?* Bacch. 97, *id flagitium sit*; 149, *ut te usurpem lubens!* Merc. 125, *nimis nili tibicen siem*; Truc. 907, *numquam hoc efficiatur opus*; And. 489, *hoc quis non credat abs te esse ortum?* 814, *clament me sycophantam*; Eun. 460, *ex homine hunc natum dicas?* Phor. 186, *incendam, instigem, laterem lavem*; Hec. 434, *vovisse hunc dicam*; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 50, 7, *periniurium siet*. H. T. 454, *nedum tu possis*, also probably belongs here. If we except instances of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim* (to be considered presently), examples of the 'should' - 'would' potential are relatively rare in Early Latin outside of the apodosis of conditional sentences. In addition to the examples just cited, I have noted only 31 other instances in the entire range of this period.

Velim, Nolim, Malim.

These forms are traditionally taken as 'should' - 'would' potentials. They are here accorded separate consideration because Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 137 ff.; 284 ff.) dissents from the usual view and explains the subjunctives as optative in character, — not as true optatives with the force of 'may I desire,' etc., but as optatives resulting primarily by attraction. Morris would find the origin of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim* (in the uses here under discussion) in expressions like *veniat velim*. *Velim*, he holds, is here attracted from *volo*. The somewhat frequent use of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim* in Early Latin with the infinitive, and with the accusative, he regards as extensions by analogy from the original attracted use. But this theory involves several difficulties:

1. In Plautus (in whose works are found most of the instances for Early Latin), *velim* occurs with the simple subjunctive some 14 times. Against these 14 instances, we have 27 other instances of *velim*

unaccompanied by the subjunctive, including 10 with the infinitive, 7 with participles and adjectives, 4 with a direct object, and 6 absolute uses. As to *malim*, that is found twice with the subjunctive. Against these two instances there are 21 others where there is no accompanying subjunctive, including 13 with the infinitive, 4 with participles and adjectives, 1 with a direct object, and 3 absolute uses. *Nolim* with the subjunctive does not occur, but is found twice with the infinitive and once with a participle. Out of 70 occurrences, therefore, of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, *pervelim*, 54 are not accompanied by the subjunctive. Granting now that attraction may account for the 16 cases of the subjunctive, how are we to account for the subjunctive in the 54 remaining instances? As already stated, Morris accounts for them by analogical extension. But this is not a plausible hypothesis. There is nothing to show that *veniat velim* is older than *hoc velim* or *adire velim*. In fact the reverse seems more likely to be true. If it is so, the theory of analogy at once becomes untenable.

2. If the theory be correct that the notion of wishing involved in *veniat* has led to the use of *velim* in *veniat velim*, then we should likewise expect a similar assimilation of mood in orders preceded by *iubeo*, *edico*, *impero*, etc., in expressions of permission accompanied by *licet*, expressions of obligations accompanied by *oportet*, and expressions of necessity accompanied by *necesse est*; i.e. we should be warranted in expecting *iubeam haec vasa auferant* instead of *iubeo auferant*; *liceat abeas* in place of *licet abeas*; *confiteare necesse sit* instead of *necesse est*; *oporteat sit diligens*, instead of *oportet*.

3. Morris's theory of modal attraction of a governing verb is not supported by other phenomena of the language.

4. The theory is gratuitous. I cannot share Morris's feeling that in a large majority of the instances of *velim*, etc., under discussion a potential sense is excluded. On the contrary, I find no instance in which it is unnatural to take the words in the ordinary potential sense of 'I should like,' 'I should be loth,' 'I should prefer.' English abounds in instances of this use of 'I should like,' 'I shouldn't want,' 'I should prefer,' equivalent to 'I want,' 'I don't want,' 'I prefer,' e.g. 'I'd like to be rich,' 'I'd like to go to Europe,' 'I'd prefer to remain here,' etc. See my Critique of Subjunctive Theories (Cornell Studies, ix), p. 74 ff., for a fuller discussion of this topic.

Examples:¹ Aul. 670, *veniat velim*; Bacch. 334, *mihi dederit velim*; Men. 909, *adeas velim*; Asin. 274, *velim servire*; Aul. 120, *velim te arbitrari*; Cas. 326, *illam diruptam velim*; Stich. 191, *lumbos diffractos velim*; Amph. 1058, *aquam velim*; Most. 266, *velim lapidem*; Cas. 464, *ut velim*! 862, *pervelim progredi*; Curc. 102, *me pervelim sepultam*; Capt. 942, *te nolim suscensere*; Merc. 539, *nolim quidem*; Poen. 1150, *facias mavelim*; Asin. 810, *emori me malim*; Bacch. 514, *malim vincere*; Aul. 661, *emortuom me malim*; Poen. 151, *istuc mavelim*; Epid. 119, *malim amicos mersos*; Eun.² 979, *te arbitrari velim*; Phor. 449, *velim facias*; Stat. 51, *velim te opperiri*; Titin. 160, *velim arare*; Ad. 727, *malim quidem*; Eun. 66, *mori me malim*; Ad. 695, *nolim te socordem*; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 24, 7, *nolim*.

Besides the foregoing examples of *velim*, *nolim*, *malim* in the weakened sense of the indicative, we find somewhat numerous instances of other potentials similarly employed. A typical example is, M. G. 689, *hoc numquam audias*. By origin this is a 'should'- 'would' subjunctive, but the notion of contingency has faded out, so that the idea is, 'you would never hear under any circumstances,' i.e. 'you never do hear.' Other examples of the same kind are: M. G. 615, *quis homo sit magis meus quam tu's?* 761, *neminem audias*; 94, *videas*; Most. 148, *nec quisquam esse auxilio queat*; 278, *quid olant nescias*; Poen. 1416, *nescias*; Trin. 554, *quamvis malam rem quaeras, illic reperias*; And. 460, *fidelem haud ferme mulieri invenias virum*, i.e. 'you scarcely ever find a man faithful to a woman;' H. T. 606, *possit quidem*; 620; Hec. 58, *paucos reperias fidelis evenire amatores*; Afran. 198, *non invenias locum ubi facias lutum*; Cato, Agr. 17, 1, *id semen legere possis*; Lucil. 346, *non rectius vivas*; Amph. 576; 769, *quid hoc sit hominis?* So And. 191; cf. Poen. 92; Asin. 407, *quid hoc sit negoti?* Scotch-English in particular abounds in similar instances of this use of the 'should'- 'would' potential with the value of the indicative, e.g. 'How old would he be?' 'He'd be five and forty;' where in ordinary English we say, 'is.' So also in Sanskrit and Greek we find the same use of the potential; Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 371 f.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 123. Cf. German, *ich wüsste nicht* = *ich weiss nicht*.

¹ Full material in Morris, *op. cit.*, for Plautus.

² The examples are complete for Terence and other Early Latin writers.

Sometimes this attenuated 'should'-'would' potential is equivalent to a future indicative, e.g. Hec. 288, at sic citius qui te expedias his aerumnis reperias; Eun. 1080, facile pellas ubi velis; Ad. 829, quovis die redducas.

Instances of the kind just cited seem to me to make it unnecessary to adopt the theory propounded by Hale, Classical Philology, i, p. 21 ff. In the article referred to, Hale, in a sentence like Trin. 914, quod teneas, id desideres, explains *desideres* as the result of formal attraction to the indefinite 2d singular subjunctive of the subordinate clause. But in the passage just cited and in others of the same sort, I should be (i.e. 'am') inclined to regard the subjunctive of the main clause as simply the same attenuated 'should'-'would' subjunctive that we have already seen in the examples enumerated above. Other instances of the same kind (several of them cited by Hale in the article referred to) are: Pseud. 137, quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas; Trin. 496, ubi mortuos sis, ita sis; 1052, quom repetas invenias; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas, tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; Amph. 705, si obsequare, una plaga resolvas; Aul. 505, quoquo venias videas; 517, 520, iam hos absolutos censeas; Cas. 562, at quom aspicias tristem, frugi censeas; Cist. 33, eas si adeas, abitum quam aditum malis; 97, si ames, melius illi consulas quam rei tuae; Pseud. 1176, ubi suram aspicias, scias posse eum; H. T. 1023, rem quom videas, censeas; Eun. 61, si postules, nilo plus agas; Phor. 344, haec quom rationem ineas quam sint suavia et quam cara sint, non tu hunc habeas praesentem deum?

In the following we have the indicative in the dependent clause: Capt. 118, si data est, numquam possis prendere; Bacch. 914, si non est, nolis neque desideres; 915, si est, non queas; Trin. 671, quom inopiast, cupias; quando copiast, tum non velis; Ad. 254, abs quivis homine, quom est opus, beneficium accipere gaudeas.

'Should'-'Would' Potential as Apodosis of Conditional Sentences.

By far the most frequent use of the 'should'-'would' potential is in the apodosis of conditional sentences. The protasis of such sentences varies in form, not only in mood (though the present subjunctive is commonest), but also in tense, and in the introductory

particles. For a fuller discussion of these points, see Conditional Sentences.

Examples: Amph. 183, (si studeant), hominem allegent; Asin. 459, (si sciat), suscenseat; Cist. 45, (si non nubat), familia pereat; Rud. 473, (si abstulerit), mi exhibeat negotium; And. 143, (si obiurges), quid facias? H. T. 74, (si sumas), plus agas; Ad. 147, (si augeam), insaniam; Acc. 102, (nisi nobis tulat opem), peream; Stat. 32, (an ubi vos sitis), ibi consilium claudeat? Afran. 31, (si non verear), nemo vereatur; Lucil. 40, (si coniuret), vix satis sit; Cato (Jord.), p. 58, 8, nolim, (si sim).

The total number of instances of the 'should'-'would' potential in apodosis is not far from 175.

In a considerable number of instances the present tense has a contrary-to-fact force like the imperfect, e.g. Amph. 907, cum ea sermonem nec habeas (nisi sis stultior); Asin. 393, (si sit domi), dicam; Epid. 331, (si habeam), pollicear; And. 310, (si hie sis), aliter sentias; 551, neque postulem (ni res moneat); Enn. Trag. 271, (si curent), bene bonis sit; Stat. 126, si linguas decem habeam, vix habeam satis. For a fuller discussion of this topic, see Conditional Sentences.

PERFECT TENSE.¹

There are some 35 instances of the perfect subjunctive used as a 'should'-'would' potential. Like the present, the perfect also looks forward to the future. Originally the perfect, being an aorist optative by origin, denoted momentary (i.e. non-continuing) action, as opposed to the present, which denoted a continuing action. This original distinction seems to hold fairly well for the Early Latin instances of the perfect potential. In no one of them is there any suggestion of continuance or duration. Elmer's theory,² that the perfect potential is more energetic than the present, does not seem to have won the approval of scholars.

The scanty material belonging under this head is about evenly divided into two classes: First, cases in which the subjunctive stands alone; second, those in which it is the apodosis of a conditional sen-

¹ See especially Cramer, *De Perfecti Coniunctivi Usu Potentiali apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos*, 1886; also Lübbert, *Der Coniunctiv Perfecti und das Futurum Exactum im älteren Latein*, p. 35 ff.

² Cornell Studies, vi, p. 114 ff.

tence. In the first class the variety of expressions is small. For the most part we have first personal forms, particularly of the *s*-perfects *faxim* and *ausim*. I give the material in full: Aul. 494, *faxim*; so also, Poen. 1091; 1093; Truc. 62 a; 348; Ad. 887, *lubens bene faxim*; so 896; Aul. 474, *non ausim praeterire*; similarly, Poen. 1358: Eun. 884; 904; M. G. 11, *haud ausit dicere*; Asin. 491, *hoc nunc dixerim*; 503, *haud negassim*; Cas. 347, M. G. 316, *non emp-sim* (both conjectural, though extremely probable and generally accepted); Truc. 629, *arbitrum ceperim*; 349, *ego istos qui nunc me culpant, confutaverim*; And. 203, *ubivis facilius passus sim quam in hac re me deludier*; Ad. 443, *haud cito mali quid ortum ex hoc sit*.

The three following passages are uncertain: Capt. 309 reads in the MSS., *hoc te monitum volueram*. Brix here reads *voluerim*, which certainly makes better sense. He is followed by Leo, who pertinently observes, “*sanum illud esset, si dixisset ‘etiam hoc.’*” Phor. 426, *tu te idem melius feceris*, and 430, *tuis dignum factis feceris*, are usually regarded as future perfects (so Dziatzko and Elmer), but it is quite possible that they may be perfect subjunctives.

In the apodosis of conditional sentences the perfect subjunctive occurs some 17 times. A typical example is Cas. 424, (*si me suspendam*), *operam luserim, fecerim, creaverim*. Sometimes the protasis also stands in the perfect, e.g. H. T. 316, (*si quid te fugerit*), *ego perierim*. For the full material, see Conditional Sentences. In no instance does the perfect subjunctive represent an apodosis as contrary-to-fact, as is often the case with the present subjunctive in this use.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

By a development of usage the details of which are not clear, the ‘should’-‘would’ potential appears also in the imperfect tense. In Plautus the usage is restricted almost wholly to the forms *vellem* and *mallem*, expressing a regret. In the case of other verbs, the imperfect in this use denotes what would be true if some contingency more or less clearly implied were real. In the great majority of cases the imperfect constitutes the apodosis of a formal conditional sentence, containing a protasis introduced by *si*, *nisi*, *ni*.

a) Without formal protasis: Asin. 589, *vellem habere*; so also Cist. 93; 506; Most. 980; Poen. 681; 1107, *magis quam vellem*;

Pseud. 309; 1057; Stich. 312; 713; Amph. 512, experiri istuc mavellem; so also Bacch. 199; 452; 1047; 1201; Cure. 512; Pseud. 131. Apart from the foregoing, the only other examples in Plautus are: Bacch. 314, *privatim servaretur rectius*; Men. 160, *esses agitator probus*; Poen. 1139, *hodie earum mutarentur nomina facerentque indignum quaestum*; Pseud. 494, *iuberes hunc trahi*; And. 326, *quam vellem*; so H. T. 185; 815; 978; Eun. 597; 786; Phor. 257; 792; Hec. 464; Ad. 532; Phor. 796, *nollem datum*; so also Ad. 165; 775; H. T. 953, *non auderet*; Eun. 606, *tum pol ego is essem*; 787, *facerent fugam*; Phor. 121, *numquam faceret*; 160, *non cura haec angeret animum*; 208, *illud minus possem*; 793, *ego ostenderem*; 797, *quor nolles?* Ad. 395, *num sineres?* Afran. 308, *vellem intervenissem*; Turpil. 10, *apisci haut possem* (*posse, codd.*); Soranus (Baehrens, Frag. p. 273), *Accius nollet, mallet*.

In a few instances the imperfect is used referring to the past, like the pluperfect, viz. Cas. 910, *quom cogito, non habuit gladium, nam esset frigidus*; And. 138, *diceret* (= *dixisset*); H. T. 1022, *pareret* (= *peperisset*). Eun. 606, *tum pol is essem qui simulabar*. In Ad. 314 ff., *animam exstinguerem, lacerarem, arriperem, statuerem, eriperem, darem, ruerem, agerem, raperem, tenderem, prosternerem*, the imperfect seems to fulfil the function of the present and to refer to the future. So also Poen. 681, *videre vos vellem quom aurum darem*.

b) With accompanying protasis. Only a few typical examples of the use are here given. For the full material, see Conditional Sentences. Asin. 860, (*ni essent*), *numquam faceret*; Aul. 286, (*si vellet*), *non velles*; Capt. 755, (*absque hoc esset*), *usque me ductarent*; Hec. 220, (*ni id fecisset*), *magis mirum foret*.

As regards the origin of the imperfect subjunctive in this use, we can hardly proceed beyond hypothesis. Presumably the use of the imperfect alone is older than the imperfect with accompanying protasis. In view of this consideration and of the practical restriction of the use in Plautus (outside of conditional sentences) to *vellem* and *mallet*, one might conclude that the usage originated with these verbs. If so, it is possible that an original *velim* or *malim adesset* became first *vellem* (*mallet*) *adesset* by a species of tense assimilation. The *vellem* or *mallet* might then easily become detached and embark upon a career of independent usage. After this usage became well

established for *vellem* and *mallem*, it would naturally extend to other verbs.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

The pluperfect potential is simply the imperfect projected into the past. But except in formal conditional sentences with expressed protasis, the usage is rare in Early Latin. Plautus has but two instances; Terence but six. Material: Epid. 628, *prius venisset*; Stich. 590, *hau maligne vos invitassem*; H. T. 540, *mansisset*; Eun. 453, *quanto melius invitasses?* 667, *illum conclusissem neque comisissem*; Phor. 159, *non potitus essem*; Ad. 397, *non olfecissem?* 630, *exorasset*.

In formal conditional sentences the material, though more extensive, is not abundant. For the full lists of occurrences, see Conditional Sentences. A few typical examples are here given: Asin. 396, (*si adesset*), *recepisset*; M. G. 718, (*si habuissem*), *satis cepissem miseriarum*; Eun. 673, (*si cessassem*), *non offendissem*.

‘MAY’ POTENTIALS.¹

Elmer in Cornell Studies, vi. p. 176 ff., protests against recognizing a ‘may’ potential for Latin. Certainly the instances of the usage are not numerous either in Early Latin or at any other period of the language. Yet, in common with practically all students of Latin syntax, I am inclined to recognize its existence in a few cases. It is impossible here to review the evidence bearing on this question. I must content myself with referring to the literature cited in the footnote. I will only urge that the ‘may’ use, though rare, is well established for Greek (Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, 238), and that the ‘may’ idea bears to the ‘should’-‘would’ idea the relation of the general to the special. Both the ‘should’-‘would’ and the ‘may’ conceptions are phases of the category of future contingency. The auxiliaries ‘should’-‘would’ suggest a future contingency which will be realized in case some special act, more or less clearly indicated, is fulfilled; the auxiliary ‘may’ suggests a future contin-

¹ Elmer, Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses (Cornell Studies, vi), pp. 176-197; Classical Review, xiv, 4; Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxxii, p. 205 ff., Proceedings, p. cxvii; Bennett, Critique (Cornell Studies, ix), p. 31 ff.; Hale, Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxxi, p. 140 ff.

gency dependent upon nothing in particular but upon things in general. Material: And. 640, aliquis dicat; Eun. 511, roget quis; And. 957, aliquis fors putet (aliquis forsitan me putet, *codl.*); P'send. 432, fors fuat an, 'there may be chance whether;' Hec. 610, fors fuat pol.

Less certain are the following: Asin. 465; sit; non sit; non edepol scio, taken by Elmer and others as subjunctive of indirect question, 'whether he is or not.' But this type of indirect question is unexampled elsewhere in the early period, and occurs at best only sporadically later. It seems more natural to me, therefore, to interpret the passage as meaning, 'may be he is; may be he isn't.' Ad. 830, metuas, 'perhaps you are afraid,' 'you may be afraid;' so also Ashmore, *ad loc.*

'CAN' - 'COULD' POTENTIALS.¹

In his *Studies* (op. cit.), Elmer protested against the indiscriminate rendering of Latin subjunctives by the modal auxiliaries 'can,' 'could,' 'might' (in the sense of 'could'). In the main I believe this attitude is sound, but with regard to one category of uses, I am equally confident that we should recognize the existence in Latin of a 'can' and 'could' potential. I refer to uses of the indefinite second singular such as *videas, videres*, 'one can see,' 'one could see.' As the English 'one could see' is ambiguous, I will say that I am here using this auxiliary in the sense of the German *konnte*, in *man konnte sehen*. Outside of the indefinite 2d singular of the present and imperfect, I do not believe that the 'can'-'could' use ought to be recognized; within these limits I am prepared to admit it in the following instances:

Present Tense: Capt. 420, videas corde amare inter se; Most. 243, videas eam me amare; Poen. 831, quodvis genus ibi hominum videas; 836, ibi tu videas litteratas epistulas; Trin. 1031, vetera amare hunc scias; And. 95, scias posse habere suae vitae modum. It will be noted that in the present tense the use is restricted to *videas* and *scias*.

¹ Elmer, *Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses*, Cornell Studies, vi, p. 198 ff.; 207 ff.; Bennett, *Critique*, Cornell Studies, ix, p. 41 ff.; Hale, *Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc.* xxxi, p. 140 ff.

The origin of the usage is probably to be sought in the 'should'- 'would' potential, particularly in those weakened potentials considered at p. 200. Cf. passages like Afran. 242, *scias abesse ab lustris procul*, where the meaning seems to hover between the 'would' and the 'can' meaning; similarly, Poen. 585, *ibi habitant, ibi eas conspicias quam praetorem saepius*. Other passages which suggest the origin of the usage are M. G. 689, 761, *audias*; H. T. 1063, *credas*; Pacuv. 176, *putes*; Acc. 395, *credas*.

Imperfect Tense: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 34, 5, *mare velis florere videres*; Curc. 331, *scires velle gratiam tuam*; Ad. 827, *scires* (*scire et*, MSS.) *liberum ingenium atque animum*; Acc. 321, *Mavortes duo congressos crederes*; Lucil. 382, *haerere putares*; Afran. 9, *terram ruere diceres*; H. T. 192, *miserum? quem minus crederes?*

These imperfects simply represent the present use projected into the past. Elmer (Cornell Studies, vi, p. 207 ff.) regards expressions of this type as 'should'- 'would' potentials,— 'you would have seen (had you been present).' For a criticism of this view, see Bennett, Cornell Studies, ix, p. 41 ff.

CHAPTER V.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.¹

PARATAXIS AND HYPOTAXIS.²

In the most primitive stages of language there are no formal subordinate clauses. Subordinate *relations*, however, exist, being indicated by the juxtaposition of independent sentences, as in English 'I believe, he is ill;' 'I fear, he will die.' In course of time every language develops certain types of independent sentences into subordinate clauses. When fully developed, such subordinate sentences usually have introductory conjunctions. But these conjunctions, like the subordinate clauses themselves, are not original. They are for the most part adverbs, which grew into conjunctive force as the sentences they introduce grew into subordinate clauses.

The name 'parataxis' is used to designate the primitive grammatical structure above referred to. While such structure is largely outgrown in time as a language develops and matures, yet it never entirely disappears as a type. Long after the development of subordinate clauses, we still continue to find, in every language, illustrations of the expression of subordinate relationship by paratactic means. Thus in Early Latin we find examples like the following: Asin. 350, *ausculta; scies*; 723, *exopta id quod vis*; *fiet*; Rud. 1010, *tange! adfigam ad terram te*; and many others in which an imperative is equivalent to a condition; see below, p. 353. At times the jussive subjunctive is used as a protasis, e.g. Cato, Agr. 157, 4, *in ea volnera teras brassicum*; *sanum faciet*; Trin. 441, *hic postulet frugi esse*;

¹ See in general Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*.

² See especially Morris, *Principles and Methods in Syntax*, p. 113 ff.; Bennett, *Critique of Recent Subjunctive Theories* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, ix, p. 66 ff.); Jolly, *Curtius' Studien*, vi, p. 215 ff.; Weissenhorn, *Parataxis Plautina*, 1884; Weninger, *De parataxis in Terenti fabulis vestigiis*, 1888; Becker, *Beiordnende und unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altrömischen Bühnendichtern*, 1888; Lindskog, *Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos*, 1896; Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, 1892, p. 82 ff.; Paul, *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*,³ p. 133 ff.; Brugmann, *Kurze Vgl. Grammatik*, p. 650; Delbrück, *Vgl. Syntax*, iii, p. 413.

nugas postulet; see above, p. 178. Sometimes a causal relation is involved, as And. 670, *hac non successit, alia adgrediemur via*; Epid. 590, *negat haec filiam me suam esse; non ergo haec mater mea est*.

In a narrower sense the name 'parataxis' is applied to those specimens of paratactic structure which ultimately develop in the history of a given language into subordinate clauses. Hypotaxis is merely another name for subordination, convenient as marking the contrast with its opposite parataxis.

It must not be thought, however, that the absence of a special subordinating particle is necessarily the mark of a paratactic form of expression and that where such particles are lacking we are to recognize independent uses. The subordinate relation often established itself without the help of special subordinate conjunctions. Thus in *tibi impero abeas*, *abeas* is just as truly subordinate as *ut abeas* in *tibi impero ut abeas*. In Early Latin we find many such subordinate clauses without an introductory conjunction. While these were undoubtedly at one time at the paratactic stage, they are at present best regarded as but the relics of an earlier parataxis. Many circumstances point to this. But the detailed discussion of this topic is best postponed until after the presentation of the main facts of usage falling under this head (p. 244 f.).

The present chapter is devoted to a consideration of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses. Our object will be to determine as far as possible the original paratactic usage out of which the several varieties of subjunctive constructions have arisen, and to give the material belonging under each.

SUBJUNCTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.¹

Subjunctive substantive clauses form an extremely large category, probably the largest single category of subordinate subjunctive uses. All the main original types of usage (volitive, optative, potential) appear in these clauses.

For Plautus we have a detailed study of these substantive clauses in the work of C. L. Durham, *Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, xiii). This work

¹ Indirect questions are not included here, but will be considered later.

has been made the basis of treatment, so far as Plautus is concerned, in what follows. For Terence and the minor Early Latin writers, I have made independent collections.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE VOLITIVE.

Most of these are regarded by many grammarians as substantive clauses of purpose, — such clauses for example as *taceat oportet*; *licet abeas*; *neesse est loquamur*; *tibi impero ut hoc mihi des*; *sino dicat*. Such a designation implies either that the clauses in question are purpose clauses, or that they once were such. Neither of these alternatives, however, represents the probable truth. Most clauses denominated ‘substantive clauses of purpose’ are developed more or less directly from fundamental volitive uses (jussive, prohibitive, deliberative), and never indicated purpose at all. The fuller justification of this statement is best presented in the following discussion of the various types of clauses falling under this head. But before proceeding to our classification, it is necessary to make certain preliminary observations on original uses and extensions.

Original Uses and Extensions.

As a typical illustration of the general type here under discussion, let us take the sentence, *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des*. Whether *ut* is present or absent is immaterial to our present purpose. In either case the dependent clause is of jussive origin (cf. Schnoor, *Zum Gebrauch von ut bei Plautus*, p. 1); *ut* is simply the adverbial particle which we have already met in independent sentences (see p. 165). The original difference between *tibi impero hoc mihi des* and *tibi impero ut hoc mihi des*, could hardly have been more than that between ‘I command you, give me this,’ and ‘I command you, just give me this.’ Probably even this distinction soon passed away, and the two forms of expression came to be felt as practically equivalent in force.

Taking now our *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* as the type, let us consider a variety of extensions to which it gave rise:

a) ‘Extensions within the Present.’ After the analogy of *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* it became natural to form sentences like:

mihi imperat (ut) hoc sibi dem;
 tibi imperat (ut) hoc sibi des;
 illi imperat (ut) hoc sibi det;
 illi imperas (ut) hoc tibi det;
 mihi imperas (ut) hoc tibi dem.

Our original sentence, *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* was undoubtedly once paratactic: 'I command you: give this to me!' But the developments just enumerated could obviously never have stood in parataxis; they are analogical 'Extensions within the Present.'

b) 'Future Extensions.' An illustration would be, *tibi imperabo (ut) hoc mihi des*. A sentence like this could obviously have never stood in parataxis. It is simply *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* projected into the future.

c) 'Past Extensions.' An illustration would be, *tibi imperavi (ut) hoc mihi dares*. Here similarly we have our *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* projected into the past.

d) 'Negative Extensions.' These are exemplified by *tibi non impero (ut) hoc mihi des*. These negative extensions may also be combined with extensions of the kinds already noted, e.g. *tibi non imperabo (ut) hoc mihi des* (future extension); *tibi non imperavi (ut) hoc mihi dares* (past extension); *mihi non imperat (ut) hoc sibi dem*; (within the present).

e) 'Interrogative Extensions.' These are exemplified by *quare tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des?* These interrogative extensions may be at the same time also future, past, within the present, or negative, e.g. *quis tibi imperat (ut) hoc mihi des?* *quis tibi imperavit (ut) hoc mihi dares?* *cur mihi non imperavisti (ut) hoc tibi darem?*

f) 'Conditional Extensions,' e.g. *si tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des*. These similarly may be also future, past, within the present, or negative; or they may contain a combination of these extensions, e.g. *si mihi non imperavisti (ut) hoc tibi darem*, a conditional negative past extension.

g) 'Extension by Analogy of the Meaning of the Verb.' Thus *te oro (ut) abeas* undoubtedly represents an original parataxis: 'Just go away! I beg you,' = 'I beg you to go away.' Now after the analogy of this we get *te exoro (ut) abeas*, 'I induce you to go away,'

‘I succeed in my-request-that-you-go-away.’ Similarly after *tibi suadeo (ut) abeas*, ‘I advise you to go away,’ we get *tibi persuadeo (ut) abeas*, ‘I succeed in my-advice-that-you-go-away,’ i.e. ‘I persuade you to go away.’ Neither *te exoro (ut) abeas* nor *tibi persuadeo (ut) abeas* could have stood in parataxis. Such combinations would have made no sense.

A recognition of the foregoing varieties of ‘Extensions’ is of great importance for an understanding of substantive clauses developed from the volitive, and in fact for many other varieties of subordinate clauses of subjunctive origin, e.g. purpose clauses, substantive clauses developed from the optative, clauses of characteristic, result clauses, etc. No theory of origin can possibly account for all, or even any proportionally large part of the phenomena ordinarily classified under any one of these syntactical usages. The greater portion of all the instances belonging under each of these heads would doubtless represent analogical extensions of one sort or another.

CLASSIFICATION OF SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE VOLITIVE.

DEVELOPED FROM THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

1. With verbs of ordering and commanding.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the subjunctive substantive clause with verbs of ordering and commanding is well illustrated by Poen. 1155, dico, tuam mihi filiam despondeas; originally paratactic: ‘pledge me your daughter; I bid you;’ cf. Truc. 839, eloquere haec erae; puerum reddat; Pseud. 511, dico ut caveas; cf. Capt. 844, ita dico, magnus ut sit, which may represent the paratactic stage; Merc. 465, ne bitas, dico; cf. And. 205, tibi dico, ne temere facias, which may represent the paratactic stage.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (12):

dico (3): Poen. 1155 (cited above); Stich. 624, dixi equidem in carcerem ires; Afran. 316, se obsequentem atque hilare dixi praebeat.

¹ Durham, p. 13 ff.

iubeo (8): Men. 955, servos iube hunc ad me ferant; Most. 930, iube in urbem veniat; Pers. 605; Rud. 708; Stich. 396; Eun. 691, iube respondeat; H. T. 737, iube maneat; Ad. 915.

postulo: Lucil. 526, rem cognoscas et adtendas postulo.

praedico: Merc. 51, praedicere omnes timerent.

2) With *ut* (87):

dico (21): Capt. 844, ita dico, magnus ut sit; Men. 990, dico ut imperium meum sapienter habeatis curae; 1044; M. G. 1089, die domum ut transeat; Pers. 281, dico ut pereas; Trin. 583, die me ut conveniat; And. 594, ut adparetur dico; H. T. 340, dicam ut revortatur; 651; 781, dicebam ut dares; Eun. 735.

edico (11): Pseud. 855, edico tibi ut properes; Men. 784, edixi tibi ut caveres; Pseud. 897; Pacuv. 187, edicam frequentes ut eant; Acc. 508, edicite ut omnes adhibeant; CIL, i, 196, 3, ex-deicendum censuere, utei venirent.

iubeo (3): Amph. 205, Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant; Poen. 4, audire iubet bonoque ut animo sedeant; Pseud. 1150, me iussit ut mecum mitteres.

mando (10): Merc. 835, mando rem ut tutemini; Bacch. 526, mandas mihi Muesilochum ut requiram; Merc. 426, mandavit mihi ut emerem; 428; Stich. 652; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, mando uti cures.

impero (5): Bacch. 702; Men. 840, imperat ut illie oculos exuram; 855; Pseud. 697; Pacuv. 331, mihi classem imperat ut deducerem.

flagito: Merc. 178, flagitas me ut eloquar.

decerno: CIL, ii, 5041, decrevit utei leiberei essent.

censeo: CIL, i, 196, 26, utei inceideretis censuit.

postulo (4): And. 550, postulo ut fiat; Eun. 1058, postulo ut mihi tua domus pateat.

praecipio (3): M. G. 795, ita praecipito mulieri ut simulet; Pseud. 161.

doceo (3): Pseud. 1194, docuit ut abduceres; Epid. 364.

perdoceo: Capt. 719, perdocere ut consulerem tibi; Poen. 195.

edoceo: M. G. 355, edocebo ut sint malae.

disco: Poen. 280, haec didici omnia:: etiamne ut ames?

Disco here serves as the passive of *doceo*, and therefore takes the same construction.

- nuntio (3) : Poen. 1118, nuntiate ut prodeat ; Eun. 339.
 monstro : Men. 788, quotiens monstravi tibi viro ut morem geras.
 praemonstro : Trin. 342, praemonstro tibi ut te miserescat.
 praedico : Pseud. 517, praedico ut caveas.
 provoco : Cure. 355, provocat me ut ludam.
 clamito : Pseud. 1276, clamitant me uti revortar.
 vocito : Most. 876; ut eant vocitantur (vocantur, *codd.*).
 respondeo : Amph. 214, respondent se suos tutari posse, proinde uti deducerent.
 tabulas fero : Bacch. 811, tabulas tetuli ut vincirer.
 negotium dare (3) : Eun. 544, mi hoc negoti dedere ut quae-ram ; And. 3.
 verbis arcesso : M. G. 1185, matris verbis arcessito ut eat tecum.

Also with the following nouns suggesting the idea of ordering :

- lex : Phor. 125, lex est ut orbae nubant.
 multa ('fine,' suggesting the order of the court) : Asin. 801, haec multa esto, vino ut careat ; Capt. 494.
 nuntius : Trag. Incert. (Ribb. i, p. 275), postquam ut venirem tetigit aures nuntius.

The substantive clause may also depend upon the general idea involved in the context, e.g. Phor. 719, transito ad uxorem, ut conveniat, i.e. 'go over to my wife and tell her to meet;' so also Pers. 165 and elsewhere.

3) With *ne* (41).

edico (14) : Pseud. 506, ne quisquam credat nummum, edicam ; 903 ; Eun. 578, edicit ne adeat ; 806, edico ne vim facias ; Hec. 565 : CIL, i, 196, 4, 7, exdeicendum censuere, nequis velet ; ibid. 19, exdeicendum, ne quisquam velet neve velent ; ibid. 10, exdeicendum sacerdos nequis eset.

dico (6) : Merc. 465, ad portum ne bitas dico ; Trin. 520, per deos dico ne tu illunc agrum tuom siris fieri ; Epid. 164, dicam ne hinc foras exambulet neve veniat ; Asin. 938 ; Ad. 796, dictum fuit ne curares.

interdico (4) : M. G. 1057, interdixi meam ne sic volgo pollicitere operam ; Pers. 621 ; Hec. 563, interdico ne velis.

mando : Cure. 549, mandasti nuntium ne spernerem ; Pacuv.

116, mandat ne fuat copia.

impero : Eun. 578, mihi ne abscedam imperat.

postulo : Stat. 139, hoc postulo ne limassis caput.

eminor interminorque : Capt. 791, eminor interminorque nequis mihi obstiterit ; And. 496, interminatus sum ne faceres.

consuefacio : Ad. 54, ne celet consuefecit.

desuesco : Titin. 46, desuevi ne quo ad cenam iret.

edoceo : Phor. 783, Phanium edocebo ne quid vereatur.

praedico : Aul. 99, praedico ne intromiseris.

praecipio : M. G. 247, id praecipiumdumst ne titubet.

nuto : Men. 612, nutat ne loquar.

monstro : Men. 788, monstravi tibi ne id observes.

auris obtundo : Cist. 118, auris obtundo ne quem ames.

signum do : M. G. 123, mihi signum dedit ne se appellarem.

documentum do : Capt. 752, illis documentum dabo ne tale quisquam facinus incipere audeat.

Also with nouns suggesting the idea of ordering : Enn. Frag. 481, hoc erit argumentum ne quid expectes amicos.

4) With *ut ne* (3) : M. G. 185 a, hoc ei dicito ut ne quoquam de ingenio degrediatur ; Poen. 888, indicasso ei ut ne enuntiet ; Bacch. 749, quid istis ad istunc usust conscriptis modum, ut tibi nequid credat ?

5) In CIL, i, 196, 10, we find *neque . . . neque* after edico, viz. magister neque vir neque mulier quisquam eset.

2. With *volo* and *nolo* in the senses, 'I want you to,' 'I want you not to.'¹

These verbs often express a mere desire. As such they govern a substantive clause developed from the optative (p. 249), or the infinitive. But they are often used to convey an authoritative command, and in that sense the substantive clause used with them is volitive in character.

a) ORIGIN. The origin of such clauses is seen in expressions like M. G. 546, erum exhibeas, — volo ; And. 418, uxorem ducas, volo. In both of these passages *volo* is equivalent to *iubeo*, *praecipio*, or some such word.

b) FORM. The material falls under the following categories :

¹ Durham, p. 20 ff.

1) With *volo*, expressed or clearly understood from the context (31); the examples are about evenly divided between the simple subjunctive (17) and the subjunctive with *ut* (14), e.g. M. G. 546, *erum exhibeas volo*; Hec. 753, *scin quid volo facias?* And. 418, *uxorem ducas volo*; Poen. 593; Pseud. 1147; Bacch. 988 a, *volo ut facias*; Rud. 1216, *volo ut memineris*; Epid. 463; Turpil. 68. There is also an instance of *volo ne . . . quidem*, viz. Phor. 819, *ne filii quidem resciscant volo*.

2) In answers to the query, *numquid vis* or *numquid aliud* (14). Here also we find the simple subjunctive (5), the subjunctive with *ut* (7), and *ne* (2). Examples: Bacch. 604, *numquid vis? : : abeas*; Curc. 525; Poen. 801; Pseud. 665, *numquid vis? : : ut abeas*; M. G. 259; 575, *numquid vis? : : ne me noveris*; Bacch. 757.

3) With *quid vis* (8). Here we regularly find the simple subjunctive, e.g. Stich. 115, *quid vis dicam?* Bacch. 692, *quid vis curem?* H. T. 846. But Phor. 322 has the subjunctive with *ut*, *quid vis nisi uti maneat?*

In *quid vis curem?* and similar expressions Durham (p. 23) suggests the possibility of taking the subjunctive as independent, as in the Greek *τί βούλει ποιῶ*; but rejects this as less natural. It may even be questioned whether *ποιῶ* in such cases was not subordinate.

4) With *vis*, *vin*, *visne*, *voltisne* (28); always with the simple subjunctive, e.g. Capt. 360, *vin vocem? : : voca*; Stich. 397, *vin administrem?* M. G. 335; Pers. 575; Eun. 894. Here again some may prefer the theory of an independent subjunctive (deliberative) reënforced by *vin*, etc., but it seems more natural to regard the subjunctive as dependent.

5) Expressions of the type, *nolo ames*. See below.

Durham (Subjunctive Substantive Clauses, p. 24) brings under the volitive head several clauses dependent upon *malo*, but these all seem to me purely optative in character.

The Type *Nolo Ames*.

Nolo followed by a simple subjunctive occurs in the following passages: Pers. 245, *nolo ames*; Cas. 232, *quam ted amo? : : nolo ames*; Pseud. 436; Most. 1176, *nolo ores (bis)*; Stich. 734, *nolo obtaedescat*; Truc. 558, *vasa nolo auferant*; Trin. 945, *nolo prae-*

dices; H. T. 701, nolo mentiare; Imbrex (Ribb. Com. p. 39) nolo te vocent; Afran. 155, nolo exeas (*es pax*, codd.); 203, nolo te videat.

Expressions of this type are best explained as arising by analogy and as modelled after expressions like *volo videas*, 'I want (direct) you to see.' English, 'I don't want you to stay out after dark,' and many similar expressions are likewise analogical, 'I don't want' having the force of 'I want you not to.'

Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 298; Principles and Methods, p. 137) offers another explanation of expressions of this kind. According to him, *nolo ames* begins with the prohibition *ne ames* and "then when the emphasis of an added verb of will is desired, *nolo* is used instead of *ne volo*." But this seems cumbrous and unnatural. The theory of analogical extension, on the other hand, finds support from Merc. 1004, nil opus resciscat.¹

3. Verbs of Begging, Requesting, etc., including, as extensions, verbs of succeeding in one's request (*impetro, exoro*).²

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause with verbs of begging, requesting, etc., is seen in such expressions as Merc. 992 a, pacem faciatis oro ('make peace, I beg you'); cf. also sentences like the following, in which the imperative is used instead of the jussive subjunctive: Ad. 281, obsecro te, istum absolvitote; And. 351, obsecro, me libera. A negative example is Most. 744, obsecro, ne indicium ero facias meo.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (14).³

quaeso (3): Capt. 340, te quaeso hunc mihi des; Men. 1073, quaeso ignoscas; And. 305, quaeso id velis.

oro (8): Amph. 257, orant ignoscamus peccatum suum; Merc. 992 a, modo pacem faciatis oro; Most. 680, roga circumducat; Pers. 634, rogarat diceret; Hec. 721, te oro adiutor sis; Pacuv. 122, hoc oro minus inexorabilem facis; CIL, i, 1175, te orant se condemnes; M. G. Arg. Acros. 13.

¹ For a fuller discussion of the question here at issue, see my Critique, p. 71 ff.; Durham, p. 25 f.

² Durham, p. 26 ff.

³ In some of the examples it may be possible that the *quaeso, oro*, or *obsecro* is merely parenthetical. It is difficult to draw the line between the parenthetical use and that with an object clause.

obsecro (3): Aul. 715, obsecro vos mi auxilio sitis; Most. 1156, te obsecro stultitiae eius ignoscas; M. G. 540, te obsecro inscitiae meae ignoscas.

amabo: Rud. 427, amabo vel tu mi aias vel neges.

2) With *ut*, very frequently (over 200 instances).

oro (73): Amph. 1144, te oro promissa ut serves tua; Epid. 728, oro te mihi ut ignoscas; Bacch. 909, oro ut facias; Merc. 997, ora ut ignoscat delictis tuis; Poen. 1015, orat operam ut des sibi; And. 538, oro ut adiuves; 548; H. T. 493, idem oro ut facias; Eun. 533, orabat ut redires; Phor. 1020, oro ut feras; Turp. 211, hoc te oro ut commiserescas.

obsecro (37): Amph. 388, obsecro ut per pacem liceat alloqui; Cist. 767, te obsecro ut reddas mihi; Curc. 630, obsecro ut nos facias certiores; Men. 1007, obsecro te operam mihi ut des; And. 402, obsecravit ut darem; H. T. 1026, obsecro ut memineris; Titin. 31, obsecro ut mihi subvenias.

quaeso (23): Bacch. 1019, quaeso ut sat habeas id; Curc. 629, quaeso uti mihi dicas; M. G. 1362, quaeso ut memineris; Aul. 611, id te quaeso ut prohibeas; Ad. 598, quaeso ut eas atque dicas; Hec. 786, quaeso ut serves; Eun. 466.

rogare (19): Curc. 330, argenti rogo ut faciat copiam; Merc. 787, rogato meum patrem ut veniat; Rud. 1212, roga ut relinquat alias res; Pers. 600, roga ut tibi percontari liceat; Ad. 776, rogat ut redeas; Hec. 390, ut sibi des rogat; CIL, i, 542, rogans ut faxseis.

obtestor (2): Aul. 791, te obtestor ut mi ignoscas; Rud. 635.

amo, particularly amabo (4): Cist. 104, nunc te amabo ut hanc hic sinas esse; Truc. 872; Eun. 537, amabo ut transeas.

invoco (3): Merc. 864, invoco vos ut me tutetis; Amph. 1093.

peto: Phor. 378, peto mi ut respondeas.

postulo: Aul. 318, infit postulare ut liceat.

expeto: Men. 762 b, expetit me ut ad sese irem; Cas. 430.

veneror: Aul. 8, venerans me ut id servarem.

exposco: Enn. Trag. 142, exposco ut fiat.

exobsecro: M. G. 169, exobsecrant videre ut liceret.

invito: Trin. 27, ni id me invitet ut faciam fides.

mentionem facio: Aul. 204, ubi mentionem fecero mi ut despondeat; Cist. 134.

litteras (epistulam) do: Bacch. 389, litteras misi ut inveniret; 561; M. G. 130.

Also upon the general idea of the context in expressions like Rud. 274, tibi amplectimur genua ut tuo recipias tecto servesque nos; Bacch. 589, paucis me misit miles, vel ut cc Philippos reddat vel ut hinc eat; Phor. 38.

3) With *ne* (34).

obsecro (15): Curc. 605, obsecro parentes ne meos mihi prohibeas; Most. 744, obsecro ne indicium ero facias meo; Capt. 443, opsecro infidelior mihi ne fuas; H. T. 291, obsecro, ne me conicias; 1028; Phor. 944, obsecro ne facias; Liv. And. Trag. 23; Acc. 555, quod te obsecro aspernabilem ne haec taetritudo me faxsit.

quaeso (7): Aul. 210, quaeso ne id te pigeat; Bacch. 1013, quaeso ne me deseras; Stat. 125, quaeso ne addas malum; 78.

oro (5): Capt. 244, te oro ne me secus honore honestes; H. T. 26, vos oratos volo ne plus possit oratio; 623; Hec. 338.

obtestor (3): Capt. 727, te obtestor, ne tu istunc hominem perdis; 319, optestor, ne tuom animum avariorem faxint divitiae meae; And. 291.

venero: Bacch. 173, venero te ne me sinas convenire.

deprecor: Asin. 946, deprecari huic seni ne vapulet.

ago: Rud. 605, ago cum illa nequid noceat.

4) With *ut ne* (7): Poen. 392, obsecro ut huic irata ne sis; And. 326, obsecro ut ne ducas; 899; Rud. 627, quaeso ut te ne pigeat; And. 834, oro ut ne inducas; Eun. 956, orante ut ne faceret; Pers. 109, (mentionem feceras) ut muraena et conger ne calefierent.

5) With *ni*: Men. 880, quaeso ni me indicetis; Pacuv. 123, ni turpassis vanitudine aetatem tuam, oro; cf. the occasional use of *ni* for *ne* in independent volitive uses (above, p. 169).

With *impetro, exoro*.¹

Just as the foregoing verbs of begging and requesting take a subjunctive substantive clause, so *impetro* and *exoro*, signifying, 'to succeed in one's request,' take by analogy the same construction; see p. 211 f.

1) Without *ut*: Trin. 591, tandem impetravi abiret; Cas. 270,

¹ Durham, p. 12; 32 ff.

quid si impetro eam illi permittat? (most editors, following Guyet, make this verse conform to the mode of expression in 269, where we have *impetro ut*).

2) With *ut* (28).

impetro (19): Cas. 269, si impetro atque exoro ut eam illi permittat; Capt. 515, ut impetres eum hominem ut convenias; Merc. 544, impetravi egomet me ut corrumperem; And. 313, impetrabo ut prodat; Eun. 181, impetrare ut concedas; Enn. Trag. 299, impetrem ut cernat; Stat. 154, quae hoc impetrarit, paelice ut meum privarem virum? Turp. 86, haec si impetro ut facias.

exoro (9): Men. 1049, si possum exorare ut pallam reddat; Rud. 1218, exores Plesidippum ut me manu emittat; Cas. 705; H. T. 358, exora ut adsinulet; 705; Phor. 489, exorare ut maneat.

3) With *ne* (5): Bacch. 521, exorabo pater ne noceat neu quid ei susceat; 690; Cas. 304, exoraverit ne Casinam ducat; Cist. 303; Hec. 52, impetrare ne inrideant.

4) With *ut ne*: only Bacch. 533, impetravi ut ne quid ei susceat.

Some regard the substantive clause with these verbs as one of result, and if one were to decide the question purely on the basis of the logical relation of the dependent clause, this attitude might seem justified; but in view of the fact that the dependent clause sometimes lacks *ut*, and in the negative form has *ne* (*ut ne*), the explanation of an extension by analogy seems sufficiently established.

In Most. 1170, aliud quidvis impetrari a me facilius perferam quam ut non ego istum pessum premam, the *ut non* clause seems to indicate that after *quam* the substantive clause was felt to be so loosely attached that the original negative (*ne*) was no longer retained.

4. Verbs of Advising, Warning, Exhorting, Reminding, Admonishing, etc., including (as extensions) verbs of Inducing, and (as extensions of verbs of Inducing) verbs of Compelling.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of this type may be seen in expressions like Merc. 1015, dicamus senibus legem censeo; Lucil. 594, submittas alios censeo; Eun. 583, adhortor properent; Hec. 766, hoc te moneo periculum facias; Phor. 102, censeo eamus; cf. Men. 569, male habeas; sic censeo.

¹ Durham, p. 35 ff.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (12): Besides the examples already cited under a, we find: Asin. 644, quod faciamus nobis suades; Trin. 681, meam sororem tibi dem suades; Poen. 730; Rud. 1275; 1277; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, censeo relinquamus, eamus; Turp. 81, hortatur quam primum proficisceret; Pers. Arg. 3.

2) With *ut* (62).

moneo (6): Capt. 240, ted ut memineris moneo; Stich. 42; Trin. 674; And. 22, ut quiescant moneo; 904, ut faciam monet.

censeo: Merc. 483, quo leto censes me ut peream.

suadeo (11): Curc. 163, ut sistas suadeo; Rud. 879, suadeo ut ad nos abeant; Asin. 914; And. 577, suadet ut maturem; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, suadent ut accipiat; Enn. Ann. 194, 11, suasset ut faceret.

hortor (7): Cas. 422, hortemur ut properent; M. G. 1189; Pers. 841, hortantur tuo ut imperio paream; Acc. 229, hortatur me ut meos manderem natos; Afran. 140; Turp. 123, hortari ut celerent lembum.

insto (4): And. 661, instare ut dicam; H. T. 895; Hee. 827, instare ut dicat.

commoneo: And. 280, neque commoneat ut servem fidem.

submoneo: Eun. 570, submonuit. : : quid? : : ut vestem mutem.

canto: Trin. 287 b, canto ut caveas.

auctor sum (7): Merc. 312, auctor sum ut me amando enices; Aul. 251; Stich. 128, auctores ita sunt, ut hinc abducam; Phor. 625, auctores fuere ut daret.

consilium do: Stich. 73, consilium dabo ut exoremus; Eun. 1045.

verba facio: Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, verba facio ut augeatis.

famam trado: Trin. 642, hanc maiores famam tradiderunt ut eorum anteparta perderes?

venit in mentem, 'the suggestion presents itself': Curc. 558, venit in mentem mihi argentum ut petam; Pseud. 134.

Also with nouns like *verbum*, *sententia* in the sense of 'advice': Curc. 32, quid istuc est verbi? : : caute ut incedas; Pseud. 379, haec meast sententia, ut consulas.

In the table of contents of Cato's *De Agr.* the topics take the form of substantive clauses dependent upon the general idea of advising or recommending, e.g. cap. 110, *virgas ut serves*.

3) With *ne* (11): Pers. 680, *ne permittas domum moneo*; Pseud. 915; Hec. 64, *moneo et hortor ne misereat*; Eun. 16, *ne erret moneo*; Stich. 608, *suades ne bitat*; Asin. 462; Cas. 341, *instat ne detur*; Enn. Ann. 253, *horitatur ne faciam*; Phor. 910, *me dehortatus est ne darem*; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, *dissuasuri ne accipiat*; Trin. 81, *ne admittam promus (= monitor) sum*.

4) With *ut ne*: only Epid. 355, *ita suasi seni ut ne tibi eius copia esset*.

5) *Ut nullus*: Phor. 547, *ni instigemus ut nullus locus relinquatur*.

6) *Ut non*: Enn. Frag. 515, *suadent Saturno ut de regno non concedat*, where *non* may be adhaerescant.

With Verbs of Inducing, Persuading, etc.

Durham (p. 37) observes, "That the subjunctive with verbs of these meanings is purely an extension after the analogy of verbs of urging, seems a necessary conclusion for two reasons: (1) Their meaning is incompatible with any theory of a jussive origin; e.g. we cannot imagine an original paratactic type of expression such as, *abeas, persuadeo* in the sense of 'depart: I persuade you to,' for such a collocation would be meaningless. (2) In striking confirmation of the foregoing impossibility is the fact that verbs of inducing are never found in Plautus with subjunctives which can be regarded as representing the original type."

It remains then to consider *persuadeo* and verbs of similar meaning as following the analogy of *suadeo*, etc.; cf. the use of *impetro* with the subjunctive after the analogy of its use with *oro*. In refutation of the view advocated by some scholars that the substantive clause with verbs of persuading and inducing is one of result, cf. the discussion in connection with *impetro, exoro*, etc. Verbs of inducing and persuading, like *impetro* and *exoro*, take *ne* as a negative and in the affirmative clauses sometimes have the subjunctive without *ut*; both of which facts point to a volitive origin. The following verbs of inducing and persuading occur in Early Latin:

1) Without *ut*: Lucil. 503, *mihi non persuadetur mutem*; M. G. Arg. I, 10, *impellit militem omisam faciat concubinam*.

2) With *ut* (21).

persuadeo (3): Merc. 331, *persuadere ut illam vendat*; Bacch. 964, *persuasit se ut amitteret*; Truc. 201.

animum induco (3); Cist. 633, *animum inducam ut consulam*; Stich. 346, *animum inducam ut arbitrer*; Poen. 877.

induco (3): Asin. 494, *numquam hodie induces ut tibi credam*; M. G. 254; Merc. 350.

impello (4): And. 524, *impulit ut crederem*; Phor. 733, *quod ut facerem egestas me impulit*; Hec. 426; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, *te impulit ut sis*.

perpello (2): Epid. 87, *perpuli ut censeret*; Bacch. 644; And. 828.

perduco: Most. 198, *nequis perduci ut vera haec credas*.

adduco: Lucil. 418, *adducta ut reiceret*.

delenio: Stich. Arg. II, 4, *delenitur ut sineret*.

exsculpo: Cist. 541, *exsculpsi ut diceret*; Lucil. 49.

animum domo: Cas. 252, *domuisti animum ut facias*.

3) With *ne* (5): Asin. 832, *possum inducere animum ne aegre patiar*; M. G. 187, *ut vincat ne is se viderit*; 568, *vincam animum ne arbitrer*; 1269; Merc. 331, *huic persuadere ut illam vendat neve det*.

With Verbs of Forcing.

Durham (p. 38) notes, "No original uses with verbs of forcing occur and this can hardly cause surprise; for an originally paratactic *cogo*, *abeas* is logically inconceivable. The only explanation of the substantive clause with these verbs seems to be that they are a further extension by analogy of verbs of inducing. Just as soon as *eum perpuli ut abiret* came to be a part of the mechanism of the language, just so soon an *eum subegi ut abiret* could be counted on as its inevitable successor." This attitude seems the sound one.

1) Without *ut*: only Rud. 681, *quae vis vim mi afferam ipsa adigit*.

2) With *ut* (24).

cogo (11): Bacch. 508, *cogam ut mendicet*; Men. 877; Most. 893, *non potes cogere ut maledicam*; Hec. 268, *cogere ut rediret*;

571; 787; Ad. 851 cogam ut cubet; Enn. Ann. 122, cogebant ut misererent.

subigo (12): Epid. 235, subigunt ut faciant; Most. 917, subegi ut sumeret; Poen. 290; Stich. 193; Trin. 848, nunc subigor ut dicam.

redigo: Acc. 515, ut credam, multa argumenta redigunt animum.

5. With *fac*, *facito*, and other forms of *facio*.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the subjunctive substantive clause with *facio* is probably to be sought in such combinations as Poen. 1035, linguam compescas face; Asin. 726, animo sis bono face; Cas. 146, facite accersatis; Trin. 800, uti celes face; Rud. 1218, fac ut exores; cf. Stich. 185, veni: sic face. No fewer than 175 instances like the above are found in Early Latin with and without *ut*, — nearly 150 of the latter alone. Apparently the construction started in connection with the imperative of *facio*, and from that extended to other forms of *facio*, e.g. Amph. 876, faciam res fiat palam; Pers. 73, faxim appareant; Stich. 177, paupertas fecit ridiculus forem; Aul. 797, feci ut esses; 545, di faciant ut siet; Pseud. 1100, facere ut det.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (140).

a) Following *fac*, *facite* (68):²

Present: Amph. 976, fac adsis, Sosia; Asin. 726, animo sis bono face; Capt. 439, fac fidelis sis; Cas. 421, fac accures; 521, fac vacent aedes; 527, fac habeant linguam tuae aedes; Cure. 414, fac sciam; so also 617; Men. 890; M. G. 277; Pseud. 696; Rud. 1023; Trin. 174; Epid. 567, fac videam; Merc. 498, face cum praeda recipias; M. G. 812, praecepta sobrie adures face; 1360; Most. 854, canem abducat face; Pers. 195, has tabellas fac des; 198; 438; Poen. 893, fac id noscam; 1035; Pseud. 157, fac plenum ahenum sit; 236; 481; Frag. 67, face olant aedes arabice; Aul. 407, facite totae plateae pateant; Bacch. 754, facite accubitus eatis; Cas. 146, facite accersatis; Pseud. 181, facite iam hic adsint; Rud. 621, facite hic lege potius liceat; H. T. 925, fac sentiat; Eun. 189, fac adducantur; 196, meus fac sis postremo animus; 207; 311; 320;

¹ See Durham, p. 40 ff.

² Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, counts only 16 instances of this usage in Plautus. In reality there are 41. Full material in Durham, op. cit. p. 40 ff.

501; 769; 1042; Ad. 381, fac macerentur; 511; 512; 813; II. T. 28, facite aequi sitis; Eun. 506, domi adsitis facite; Ad. 24, facite aequanimitas poetae augeat industriam; Pacuv. 208, fac hanc operam mihi des; 281; Stat. 290, fac velis; Turp. 146, fac potiar; Enn. (Frag), 529, 7, fac emas; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, opera omnia mature conficias face; 26, fac extergeantur; 31, 1; 32, 1; 37, 5; 161, 4.¹

Perfect: Aul. 273, curata fac sint; Amph. 971, parata fac sint omnia; 979, fac commentus sis; 981, haec curata sint fac sis; Most. 400, aedes iam fac oclusae sint; Pseud. 190, fac sis delatum huc mihi frumentum; Capt. 736, in lapicidinas facite deductus siet; Men. 867, facite inflexa sit pedum pernicitas; 992, facite ablatus sublimen siet. Morris (Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 165) takes these perfects (with the exception of Amph. 979) as presents; without good reason, as it seems to me. See below, p. 242, for further examples of the perfect in substantive clauses.

b) Following *facito*, *faciunto*, *facitote* (40):² Asin. 238, syngraphum facito adferas; Cas. 523, facitodum colas; Most. 216, hoc unum facito cogites; Pers. 445, facito mulier ad me transeat; Poen. 1084, facito sis reddas; 1278; 1414; 1418; Pseud. 166, glandium sumen facito in aqua iaceant; Rud. 1219, tua filia facito oret; Stich. 47, memineris facito; Trin. 485, semper tu hoc facito cogites; Men. 866, facitote sonitus ungularum appareat. A single instance of the perfect occurs in Bacch. 96, facito opsonatum nobis sit opulentum opsonium; H. T. 550, facitodum eadem memineris; Ad. 500, hoc tu facito cum animo cogites; 808; Titin. 169, facito exvibrisses; 172; Cato, Agr. 25, facito studeas; 26, facito habeas; 41, 3, facito coniungas; 41, 4; 43, 1; 46, 2; 55; 69, 2; 71 (bis); 76, 3; 77; 87 (bis); 101; 108, 1; 143, 1; CIL, i, 197, 10, facito ioudicetur; ibid. 11, bona eius possideantur facito; 198, 15, facito recitentur; 23, facito iouret; so 44; 57, facito possideantur; 200, 28, faciunto pateant.

c) With *faciam*: Amph. 63, faciam sit tragicomoedia; 876, faciam res fiat palam; M. G. 1398, ut faciam pendeant crepundia.

d) With *faxo* (18): Amph. 589, faxo ista expetant mendacia; 972; Asin. 876, faxo ipsum hominem manifesto opprimas; Bacch.

¹ Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, following Holtze, reckons only 3 instances of *fac* with the simple subjunctive in Cato.

² Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 251, counts only 4 instances of this usage for Plautus. In reality there are 14 instances.

864, faxo haud dicat; Cure. 587, faxo reperias; Men. 113; 540; 644; Most. 68, aliquis faxo ad villam adferat; 1133; Pseud. 949; Trin. 62; 882; Truc. 643; Ad. 209, accipiat faxo; 847; with the perfect: Phor. 1028, faxo sit mactatus; Afran. 67, mitem faxo faciant fustibus.

e) With *faxim*—only in Plautus—(7): Amph. 511, faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis; Aul. 494, faxim muli sint viliores; Merc. 826, faxim plures sint vidui; Pers. 73, faxim nusquam appareat; Trin. 221; Truc. 62 a; 348.

f) With other forms of *facio*: Amph. 632, utinam di faxint infecta dicta re eveniant tua; Cato, Agr. 20, 2, faciat habeat; Titin. 103, me facit festinem.

2) With *ut* (230).

a) With *fac*, *facite* (47):¹ Amph. 978, fac Amphitruonem ut abigas; 981; Asin. 824, fac ut illi turbas concias; Capt. 337, fac is homo ut redimatur; Cas. 714, face ut impetres; Men. 948, ad me face ut deferatur; 1014; Most. 1145, fac ut tu meam timeas vicem; Pers. 526; Poen. 422, fac ut hunc lenonem perdam; Pseud. 210; 696 c; Rud. 698, fac ut ulciscare; 1088; 1218; Trin. 800; Truc. 478; with the perfect: Asin. 90, face id ut paratum sit; Poen. 580, fac modo ut condocta tibi sint dicta (with present perfect force); Cas. 746, facite cenam mihi ut ebria sit; Cure. 314, facite ut gaudeam; M. G. 1395, facite inter terram atque caelum ut sit; Most. 78; Pers. 92, collyrae facite ut madeant; Poen. 1390; Pseud. 163; 177; Stich. 65; 309, fores facite ut pateant; And. 408, fac apud te ut sies; 483; 712, fac ut venias; H. T. 84, fac me ut sciam; 592; Eun. 281, fac ut admittar; 362; Eun. 815, fac ut memineris; Phor. 671; 784; Hec. 764; 47, facite ut sit; Acc. 114, facite gratum ut sit; Titin. 130, facite in suo quique loco ut sita sint; Lucil. 616, face dignam me ut vobis putem; Cato, Agr. 23, 1, fac ut parentur.

b) With *facito* (40):² Aul. 257, illud facito ut memineris; so also Cure. 210; Bacch. 327; M. G. 354; Pseud. 515; Bacch. 36,

¹Blase, Hist. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, reports the instances of *fac ut* in Plautus as 7. In reality there are 29. Following Holtze, Blase (ibid.) gives the instances of the same usage occurring in Cato as 3. But in 2 of the 3 examples cited by Holtze there is no authority for the *ut*. The only instance I have discovered in Cato is Agr. 23, 1, fac ut parentur.

²Blase reports 15 instances of this usage for Plautus and 14 for Cato. The correct figures are 20 and 17 respectively.

facito ut subvenias; 1153; Cist. 62; Capt. 689; Cas. 524, facito ut veniant; Cure. 213; Cist. 64; Men. 437, facito ut venias; so M. G. 1177; Merc. 279, facito ut nunties; 278; 565, facito ut cogites; so also Stich. 519; Pers. 388; Stich. 148, facito ut sciam; Hec. 769, ut sit facito; Ad. 845, facito ut serves; Titin. 23, facito ut multetur malo; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, aratra facito uti habeas; 8, 2, facito uti serantur; 23, 3, facito uti pendeat; 25, facito uti servetur; 31; 32, 1, facito uti ducas; 32, 2; 33, 1; 42, facito ut conveniat; 48, 2; 69, 1, facito ut suppleas; 70, 2; 85; 90; 141, 4; 151, 4, facito uti addas; facito uti purges.

c) With other forms of *facio* (115).

Present indicative (15), e.g. Cist. 645, ut vivam facis; Rud. 244, facis ut velim; H. T. 58, facit ut moneam; Phor. 766; Hec. 211, inimici ut sint facis; 275, faciunt ut videamur; Stat. 233, facis ut velim.

Future indicative (53), e.g. Amph. 1085, faciam ut praedices; Capt. 856, faciam ut cupias; Cure. 691, faciam ut accubes; M. G. 661, ut fateare faciam; Poen. 372, faciet ut sis civis Attica; Rud. 1084; And. 701, faciam ut credat; Eun. 309, faciam ut cognoscas; 801; Phor. 776. There is one instance of the perfect, Men. 1061, facietis ut abstulerim.

Perfect indicative (17), e.g. Aul. 797, quem avom feci ut esses; Capt. 931, fecisti ut possim; M. G. 1257; And. 603, feci ut fierent; Hec. 36, fecere ut exirem; 121; CIL, i, 551, feci ut cederent.

Future perfect indicative: Phor. 430, feceris ut amici simus; Cato, Agr. 139, fecerit uti id recte factum siet.

Present subjunctive (7), e.g. Aul. 545, di faciant ut siet; M. G. 346; Poen. 489; CIL, i, 196, 30, faciatis utei dissmota sient.

With *faxo, faxim*: Asin. 897, faxo ut scias; Pseud. 923 e, ita ille faxit Iuppiter ut adsiet.

Infinitives (15), e.g. Pers. 414, possum te facere ut argentum accipias; Poen. 442, si nequeo facere ut abeam; Hec. 774, facere ut redeat; Cato, Agr. 133, 3; Cure. 555, quid refert me fecisse ut oboedirent; H. T. 396, fecisse ut compararem; Most. 423, facturum ut fugiat; Ad. 750, facturum ut habeas.

Opus est facto, usus est facto: Merc. 566, opus hoc facto existumo, ut eam; Rud. 398, usus factost ut eam intro.

An instance of *nisi ut* following *faciam* occurs, Merc. 712, *quid nunc faciam nisi ut adeam atque adloquar?*

3) With *ne*. This form is rare, the idea being usually expressed by a prohibitive subjunctive or by *cave* with the subjunctive. The examples are: Most. 1145, *fac ego ne metuam*; 389, *ita patrem faciam tuom non modo ne intro eat*; Cist. 523, *faxint ne ego oppingam* (Schoell's conjecture; the MSS. have a lacuna) *vivos savium*; Poen. 908, *ita di faxint ne apud lenonem hunc serviam*; Hec. 839, *fecisse ne eveniret*; Acc. 88, *facit ne dubitem*.

4) With *ut ne*, Most. 423, *facturum ut ne etiam aspicere aedis audeat*; M. G. 149, *eumque ita faciemus ut, quod viderit, ne viderit*.

Most scholars have regarded these substantive clauses with *ne* and *ut ne* after *facio* as consecutive in character, but it seems methodically much sounder to regard them as purely formal extensions of the type *fac cures*, etc. Logically, to be sure, the dependent clause denotes a result, but so it does in *fac cures* and similar expressions. In three passages (Most. 389; Poen. 909; M. G. 149) we find *ita* in the main clause, but *ita* here is not a particle of intensity, but is used merely to anticipate the dependent clause; cf. my Critique, p. 10; Durham, p. 49. Yet *facio* does also at times take a genuine substantive clause of result. This, however, is rare; see below, p. 299.

With *Efficio*, *Perficio*, and Similar Verbs.

These verbs mean 'to succeed in one's effort,' and bear the same relation to *fac* that *persuadeo* bears to *suadeo*; or *exoro* to *oro*; see above, p. 219. The subjunctive clause with *efficio* and *perficio*, therefore, arises by analogy; for while *linguam compescas face* was undoubtedly originally paratactic, 'hold your tongue! mind you do!' it seems unnatural so to explain, e.g. Asin. 103, *perficito ut habeat*. This and similar expressions, therefore, are purely formal extensions of *facio* with the subjunctive. The material under this head is not extensive. It is as follows:

perficio: Asin. 103, *perficito argentum hodie ut habeat filius*; Eun. 21, *perfecit sibi ut inspiciundi esset copia*; 1055, *perfice hoc ut hae-ream in parte aliqua apud Thaidem*; Hec. 20, *perfeci ut spectarentur*; Lucil. 543, *hau perficiam ut me amare expediat*; CIL, i, 33, *Mors perfecit tua ut essent omnia brevia*; 542, *perficias ut faciat*.

efficio: Most. 416, efficiam ut liqueant omnia.

The influence of these verbs seems to be responsible for the employment of the subjunctive with the following verbs also: And. 389, reddes omnia incerta ut sient; Most. 706, exsequi certa res est ut abeam; Amph. 1055, videntur omnia consequi ut opprimar; Cas. 701, perpetrem ut nubat mihi; Pers. 237, numquam exterebrabis tu ut sis peior quam ego siem; Cato, Agr. 114, 1, vinum si voles concinnare ut alvom bonam faciat; Stich. 746, repperit odium ocus sua immunditia quam in perpetuom ut placeat munditia sua. In And. 334, we have *efficere qui* used instead of *efficere ut*: efficite qui detur.

6. With *curo* and expressions of striving.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause with *curo* and expressions of striving is seen in Cato, Agr. 73, bibant curato, lit. 'let them drink; see to it! Cf. *ibid.* 143, 1, curato faciat.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*. Besides the passages above cited, the only instances seem to be Bacch. 550, ille accuratum habuit quod posset mali faceret; Cael. Antip. p. 102, 35 (Peter), curabo tibi cena sit cocta.

2) With *ut* (70).

curo (29): M. G. 1, curate ut splendor meo sit clipeo; Most. 208, istuc <cures> ut ille amet; Pers. 527, cura ut curetur; Pseud. 72, ut scires curavi; Rud. 193; Stich. 679; Trin. 1105; Phor. 905, curavi hoc ut esset fides; 830; Cato, Agr. 2, 5, curare uti perficiantur; 5, 4.

accuro: M. G. 165, adcuratote ut agitent convivium; Trin. 78.

contendo: Acc. 369, contendam ut habeam.

id ago: Trin. 699, id agis ut effugias; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, id egerunt ut vos potius doleatis quam ego ingemiscerem.

nitor (3): Merc. 111, nitere erus ut servetur; Most. 128; Lucil. 439.

studeo (6): Poen. 575, lenonem ut perdas, id studes; H. T. 382, id studuisti ut mores forent; Hec. 262; Ad. 868; Capt. Arg. 4, studens ut recuperet; Cato, Agr. 5, 8, stude ut habeas.

adnitor: Amph. 13, adnitier lucrum ut vobis suppetat.

festino: Trin. 615, quid festinet sentio, ut evortat Lesbianicum.

tento: Acc. 66, tenta (tanta, *codd.*) ut protrahas.

experior: Most. 237, ut sim parcus experiri.

¹ Durham, p. 50.

incipio: Ad. 238, hoc incipere ut postulet.

operam do (addo) (20): Poen. 1204, addunt operam ut placeant; Cas. 16, verum ut cognoscant dabimus operam; Trin. 860, dabo operam ut sentiat; And. 243, operam dat ut abstrahat; Eun. 63, des operam ut insanias; Phor. 760.

rem gero: M. G. 577, scio quam rem gerat: ut comprehendar.

After the analogy of substantive clauses with *curo*, we find similar clauses dependent on the noun *cura* and other nouns of related meaning. Thus:

cura (4): Stich. 652, curaest ut videam; M. G. 41; Aul. 364.

dolus: Capt. 47, confinxerunt dolum ut maneat.

fallacia (3): Poen. 774, compositast fallacia ut eo me privent; Pseud. 1193.

sycophantia (3): Bacch. 740, sycophantias componit ut auferat; M. G. 767.

fabrica: Poen. 1099, hanc fabricam apparo ut te allegemus.

astutia: M. G. 237, hanc astutiam ut dicam.

techina: Bacch. 392, techinam fecit ut mihi copia esset.

tela: Bacch. 350, haec tela ut copem facerem filium.

We find also the adjective *diligens*: Amph. 630, memor sum et diligens ut compareant.

Qui = *ut* occurs in the following: M. G. 768, sycophantiam qui admittiletur miles; 138, machinas qui facerem; Trin. 688.

3) With *ne* (12): Curc. 30, curato ne sis intestabilis; 138; Bacch. 1030, ne perierem cura; Phor. 713, curabo ne duit; Hec. 227; 738, ne faciam adcuro; Ad. 710, magnam inicit curam ne faciam; Cas. 772, ei rei dant operam, ne cenet senex; Pers. 372; And. Alt. Ex. 2, operam dedi ne dicas.

4) With *ut ne*: Trin. 688, prospicere ut inops ne siem; Hec. 595, haec nunc curast maxuma ut ne quoi mea longinquitas aetatis obstet.

5) With *qui ne* = *ut ne*: And. 335, id agam qui ne detur.

6) *Ut neque . . . neque*: H. T. 964, cepi rationem ut neque egeres neque perdere.

7. With *Vide, Videto*, 'see to it,' etc.¹

¹ Durham, p. 52.

a) **ORIGIN.** The origin of substantive clauses with *vide*, *videto*, is seen in such expressions as Asin. 755, scribas, vide; Amph. 629, vide ex navi efferantur; Most. 558 (549 a), videto ut capias.

b) **FORM.**

1) Without *ut*. This is found only in Plautus (3). Besides Amph. 629 and Asin. 755 already cited above, we find: Poen. 578, vide sis calleas.

2) With *ut* (13): Truc. 711, vide ut tu tuom item efficias; Pers. 607, in proelium vide ut ingrediare; M. G. 1397, vide ut istie tibi sit acutus culter; Aul. 614, vide ut auferam; Most. 558, videto ut capias; And. 735, ut subservias vide; Acc. 313, quam ut serves vide; Afran. 177, vide ut puellam curent; Cato, Agr. 9, id videto uti opus siet; 60, videto ut seras; 76, 4; 84; with perfect: Hec. 841, vide ut mi haec certa attuleris.

3) With *ne* (24): Capt. 584, vide nequid insistas; Cure. 325, vide ne me ludas; M. G. 1279, vide ne sies in expectatione; Poen. 358, vide ne pectas; Pseud. 663; 942, vide ne titubes; Bacch. 201, vide nequis tractet; 744; M. G. 983, ne amittam vide modo; Pers. 28, vide ne transfigant; 383, videto ne faciat. Perfect: Most. 966, vide ne devorteris atque biberis; Pseud. 1096, vide modo ne illic sit contechinatus quippiam. H. T. 212, vide ne abeas; 352; 369, vide ne ruas; Eun. 380, vide ne nimium calidum hoc sit; Phor. 803, vide ne pecces; Hec. 484, vide ne insistas; Ad. 550, vide ne inruat; Acc. Praet. 32, vide ne gerat; Afran. 186, ne requiram te vide; Cato, Agr. 1, 5, videto sumptuosus ager ne sit; 107, 2, videto ne aduras.

c) **RANGE OF USE.** The usage is confined almost entirely to combinations with the imperatives *vide*, *videto*. There is one instance of an equivalent jussive, viz. Cato, Agr. 5, 5, videat clausa uti siet; also five instances of *videndumst*: Epid. 37, videndumst ut suppetat; Most. 412; H. T. 694, videndumst amici res in tuto ut conlocetur;¹ Hec. 729, videndumst ne impetrem. Other forms are: And. 456, ut fiant videro; Phor. 622, quor non vides ut componamus? H. T. 670, nisi aliquid video, ne resciscat. *Provideo* occurs Phor. 779, provisum est ne abeat.

¹ H. T. 689 reads amici res est videnda in tuto ut conlocetur. If Terence wrote *videnda* and not *videndum* (as in the same expression in 694), it is a purely formal attraction due to the proximity of *res*.

8. With *Cave*, *Caveto*, etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. With Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 379) and Delbrück (Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 420), I regard *cave facias*, etc., as a purely analogical phenomenon. Just as the Romans said: *fac abeas*, 'see that you go away!' so also they came to say by analogy: *cave abeas*,² 'avoid going away!' 'don't go away!' In expressions of the type, *cave ne cadas*, we have an originally paratactic prohibitive.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*. Here we have both the present and perfect subjunctive. The perfect in such case always refers to the future, never to the past. It is slightly commoner³ than the present. Where *ut* is absent, the governing verb is almost exclusively restricted to the forms: *cave*, *cavete*, *caveto*. The only exceptions I have noted are: Cas. 902, *cavebunt faciant*; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, *caveat quam minimum in cellam introeatur*, where, however, *caveat* = *videat*.

a) Present Tense (31): Bacch. 1033, *cave tibi ce nummi dividiae fuant*; Capt. 431, *cave tu mi iratus fuas*; 439, *cave fidem fluxam geras*; Cure. 461; Cas. 530, *cave tu in quaestione mihi sis*; 902; Epid. 437, *cave praeterbitas ulla aedis*; Most. 810; 1025; Pers. 51; 816, *cave sis me attigas*; so Acc. 304; Rud. 704. In Poen. 117, *cave dirumpatis*, we even have the plural after *cave*. And. 403, *cave sentiat*; H. T. 1031, *cave audiam*; 1032; Phor. 764, *cave resciscat*; 993; Ad. 170; Naev. Trag. 36, *cave sis contendas*; Stat. 116, *decolles cave*; Incert. vaticin. Baehrens, Frag. p. 35, *cave sinas*; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, *caveto alienam disciplinam temere contemnas*; 28, *caveto effodias aut feras*; 34, 1; 66, 1; Aul. 660, *cave sis te videam*; Stich. 37, *cave sis audiam istuc*; Naev. Com. 82; Acc. 456, *cave lassitudo cursum levet*.

b) Perfect Tense (38): Amph. 608, *cave quicquam mihi responderis*; Asin. 256, *cave tu idem faxis*; so also: 625; M. G. 1125; 1245; 1372; Most. 808; Truc. 943; H. T. 187; Naev. Com. 47; Asin. 467, *cave supplicassis*; Aul. 90, *cave quemquam in aedis intromiseris*; 608, *cave quocquam indicassis*; 618, *cave tu illi fidelis fueris*; Bacch. 910, *cave parsis in eum dicere*; 1188, *quod di dant cave culpa tua amissis*; 402, *cave sis te superare servom siris*; so Epid. 400; Most.

¹ Durham, p. 54 ff.

² For other explanations of origin, see Durham, p. 54 f.

³ Not "bedeutend häufiger," as stated by Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, 1, p. 254.

401; Cas. 332, tu istos cave deos flocci feceris; so also M. G. 1368; Poen. 1023; Stich. 285; Trin. 513; Men. 994, cave quisquam vostrum flocci fecerit; Cas. 404, cave (Bothe's conj. for *ne* of the MSS.) obiexis manum; Cist. 300, cave tu umquam bellum sumpseris; Epid. 439, cave ad me rettuleris pedem; Merc. 113, cave pigritiae praeverteris; 484, cave tu istuc dixis; so also Vid. 83; Most. 523, cave respexis; Pers. 389, cave sis tu istuc dixeris; so also Trin. 555; Ad. 458; Vid. 91, cave demutassis; And. 760, cave excessis; H. T. 826, cave admiratus sis.

2) *Caveo ne* (60).

a) With *cave, caveto* (24): Amph. 845, cave sis ne tu te perdis; Asin. 372, caveto ne suscenseas; Aul. 584, cave ne tu inmutassis nomen; Most. 324, cave ne cadas; 326; Pseud. 1296; Trin. 1011; H. T. 302, cave ne studeas; Eun. 751, cave ne, prius quam hanc accipias, amittas; Acc. 191, cave ne implices; Afran. 279, cave ne pendear; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, cave ne ares neve impellas; 20, 2, caveto ne sint; 32, 2, caveto ne praecipites et ne praestringas; 37, 4, caveto doles neu cadas neu tangas; 38, 2; *ibid.* neve noctu neve ullo tempore intermittatur caveto; 38, 4; 40, 2; 45, 2; 49, caveto ne saucies; 53; 161, 2; 161, 4; 162, 2; 31, 2.

b) With other forms of *caveo* (35), e.g. Aul. 101, ne intromittatur cavet; Capt. 255; Bacch. 544; H. T. 235, caves ne videat; Asin. 373, cavebis ne me attingas; Merc. 189, quin cavisti ne eam videret? And. 444, cavit ne esset; Rud. 378; Merc. 958; Men. 270, caverō ne tu delinquas neve ego irascar; Pseud. 478; 128, a me ut caveant ne credant mihi; Stich. 121; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, caveat ne tollat; 67, 2; 22, 1; Amph. 944, primum cavissee oportuit ne diceret; Hec. 470, cavissee ne ulla contumelia fieri posset; Capt. 253, ne in quaestione essemus cautum intellego; Merc. 466, ne hic resciscat cauto opus est; Most. 902.

c) With *cautio, cautior*: Bacch. 597, cautioſt ne nucifrangibula excussit ex malis meis; Poen. 445, mihi cautioſt ne obiexim moram; Pseud. 170; And. 400, ne resciscat cautioſt; Ad. 421; Pseud. 298, cautiores sunt ne credant alteri.

In expressions of the type *cave facias*, we noted that the perfect tense is slightly commoner than the present. In expressions of the type *caveo ne*, the perfect is extremely rare, the only instances I have

noted being Aul. 584; Poen. 445; Bacch. 597. The governing verb is not restricted to the imperative (as in case of *cave facias*, *cave feceris*), but we more often find other forms, as *cavere*, *cavet*, *cavero*, *cavistis*. See the examples cited above. By analogy we find also *cautio est* (Pseud. 170) and *cautior* (Pseud. 298) followed by a *ne* clause. Peculiar is Men. 785, *edixi ut caveres* neuter ad me iretis.

As regards meaning, there seems a slight difference between *cave* and *cave ne*; *cave* with the simple subjunctive always conveys a prohibition; *cave ne*, sometimes at least, expresses genuine concern or solicitude, e.g. Most. 324, *cave ne cadas*; 326; Amph. 845; Trin. 1011.

3) *Caveo ni*: CIL, 200, 6, *exceptum cavitumque est nei divideretur*; Most. 924, *ausim non cavere ni quid committam tibi*?

4) *Caveo ut*. Of this the following examples occur: Bacch. 42, *qui caveat ut se revehat domum*; cf. 44; Capt. 225, *cauto opus est ut hoc sobrie agatur*; Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 132, *lege cavit vitia uti transcenderent auctoris poenae*. But *cave* here has the force of 'see to it,' not, as in the foregoing material, of 'avoid,' 'guard against.'

For a discussion of the untenable theory that *cave*, *cave ne* with the perfect are more energetic than *cave*, *cave ne* with the present, see Elmer, Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, 133 ff.; Bennett, Critique, p. 48 ff.

9. Verbs of Permitting, Granting, Allowing.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of substantive clauses with verbs of permitting is indicated by And. 895, *age dicat*; *sino* (probably paratactic); cf. Ad. 996, *sino*; *habeat*. With *licet*: Phor. 347, *ludas licet*; originally, 'play! you may;' i.e. 'you may play.'

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (65). This is the commonest form, being very frequent with *sino* and *licet* in Early Latin. With *licet*, *ut* is never used in Early Latin, and with *sino* but once: Hec. 590, *neque sinam ut dicat*. With *sino* the imperative (*sine*, *sinito*, *sinite*) is practically the unvarying form of the verb when governing a substantive clause in Early Latin. The only exceptions are Hec. 590 (just cited) and M. G. 54, *sivi viverent*. Examples:

sino (48): *sine*: Asin. 460, *sic sine astet*; Cas. 206, *sine quod lubet id faciat*; 206, *sine amet*; 437, *sine modo rus veniat*; M. G.

¹ Durham, p. 60 ff.

1244; H. T. 1050, sine te exorent; Eun. 185; 283, sine praetereat; 739, sine veniat; Hec. 744, sine dicam; Ad. 815; Stat. 72, sine nictentur; 73; *sinite*; M. G. 1084, sinite abeam; Hec. 10, sinite sim; *sinito* (only in Cato); Cato, Agr. 24, sinito distabescat; 91, sinito combibat; so 109; 91 sinito arescat; so 116; 92; 95, 2; 96.

licet (15): Capt. 303, laedat licet; Epid. 471, habeas licet; Merc. 989, habeat licet; Most. 713, incusses licet; Rud. 139, sis licet; Trin. 1179, et tute item videas licet; Asin. 718, licet laudem Fortunam; Phor. 347, ludas licet; Naev. 127; Stat. 50, liceat legant; Titin. 27, nec licet fullonibus quiescant; Lucil. 60, licet erret; Cato, Agr. 83, licebit faciat; 158, 2, licebit bibas; 161, 3, usque licebit vellas.

concedo, do: Amph. 11, concessum et datum nuntiis praesim.

2) With *ut* (29). This usage is relatively rare with verbs, but is common with nouns. Examples:

sino: Hec. 590, neque sinam ut dicat.

concedo: Hec. 258, haud tibi hoc concedo ut velis.

do: Eun. 395, est istuc datum ut grata sint; And. Alter Ex. 10, ut obsequeretur dedit.

mitto: Amph. 546, mitto uti cedas.

patior: Epid. 148, patierin ut ego me interimam? In the classical period *patior* regularly takes an *ut*-clause only when accompanied by a negative (*non patior*).

committo (5): Aul. 450, neque committam ut siet; Bacch. 1037, haud committam ut dicas; Stich. 640; Ad. 159, non unquam committam ut vapulet; Lucil. 560, committit ut pereat.

nihil interdico: Capt. 694, nihil interdico aiant vivere.

After the analogy of verbs of permitting, several nouns denoting permission, opportunity, etc., also take an *ut*-clause. Thus:

copia (5): M. G. 769, hanc efficiamus copiam ut abducatur; Pers. 255.

potestas (5): Capt. 934, di eam potestatem dabunt ut muneretur; H. T. 35, date potestatem ut liceat; 721.

occasio (5): Bacch. 673, occasio fuit ut sumeres; Epid. 645, non habeo ullam occasionem ut fabuler.

spatium (2): And. 623, spatium ut sumam; Hec. 130, spatium solitudinis ut conloqui posset.

ansa: Pers. 671, quaerere ansam infectum ut faciat.

3) With *qui* (= *ut*) and the subjunctive: Trin. 135, *nec qui deterior esset faceres copiam*; Vid. 87, *qui vivam copiam facis*.

10. With Verbs of Deciding, Resolving, etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. The starting-point of this usage may very well have been the employment of the subjunctive of determined resolution (see p. 161) in expressions originally paratactic, e.g. *profestos festos habeam: hoc decrevi*, 'I'm bound to regard; that's what I've determined to do.' Starting thus in the first person, the usage might then easily extend itself to other persons, and then to nouns denoting 'decision,' 'resolve,' etc.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (9): Poen. 501, *profestos festos habeam, decretumst mihi*; Asin. 248, *certumst sumam faenore*; Amph. 1048, *certumst intro rumpam in aedis*; Cas. 448, *certumst hunc praemittam*; Bacch. 382, *certumst iam dicam patri*; Aul. 681, *certumst malam rem potius quaeram cum lucro*; Capt. 778, *nunc certa res est coniciam in collum pallium*; Amph. 635, *dis est placitum plus mali adsit*.

In view of Merc. 472, *certumst ibo atque dabo*, the subjunctive is uncertain in most of the above examples; yet with Durham (p. 84) and Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 145) I am inclined to regard the ambiguous forms as subjunctive.

In Men. 1058, *certissimumst mepte potius fieri servom quam te emittam*, we have an instance of this subjunctive after *quam*.

2) With *ut* (16).

paro: M. G. 295, *ut pereas paratumst*.

comparo: Phor. 41, *comparatumst ut addant*; Afran. 117, *comparatumst uno ut simus contentae viro*.

statuo: M. G. 727, *statuit ut veneat*.

constituo: Pseud. 549, *ut irem constitueram*.

visum est: Phor. 619, *visumst mi ut temptarem*.

voveo: Hec. 434, *vovisse hunc dicam ut me rumperet*. For the later period I have discovered only one similar example, Justin, xxi, 3, 2, *voverant ut virgines suas prostituerent*.

placitum est: Amph. 635, *divis est placitum voluptatem ut maeror consequatur*.

¹ Durham, p. 63 ff.; 83 f.

animatus sum: Asin. 505, an ita tu's animata ut qui matris
expers imperi sies?

animus ('resolve'): Aul. 371, volui animum confirmare ut
bene haberem me; so Capt. 242.

sententia: Aul. 383, accessit animus ad meam sententiam
ut nuptum darem; Cure. 217, sententiam ut qui me nili faciat nec
salvom velit.

consilium: Most. 1049, capio consilium ut senatum convocem.

sors ('doom'): Cas. 300, mihi optinget sors.: ut quidem
pereas.

3) With *ne*: Cure. 704, dum quidem iudices ne quisquam argen-
tum auferat; M. G. 725, aequom fuit deos paravisse uno exemplo ne
omnes vitam viverent.

4) With *uti ne*: Cato, Agr. 1, 1, sic in animo habeto, uti ne
emas, neve parcas, et ne satis habeas.

11. With *potin*, etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. The original meaning in expressions like *potin abeas*
(Pers. 297) was 'Go away! Can't you?' So Poen. 916, *potin ut*
taceas, 'Just hush! Can't you?' Pers. 175, *potin ne moneas*.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*, only in Plautus, Pers. 297, *potin abeas*; Cas.
731, *potin a med abeas*.

2) With *ut* (17): Bacch. 751, *potin ut cures*; so Merc. 495;
Pseud. 235; Pers. 175, *potin ut taceas*; so Poen. 916; Pseud. 940;
942; Men. 466, *potin ut quiescas*; Merc. 890, *potin ut animo sis tran-*
quillo; Most. 396, *potin ut animo sis quieto*; Amph. 903, *potin ut*
abstineas manum; so Rud. 424; Trin. 628, *potin ut sinas*; Pseud.
263, *potin ut huc respicias*; 393, *potin ut abeas*; M. G. 926, *potin*
ut hominem mihi des; Ad. 539, *potin ut desinas*; Afran. 202, *potin*
ut dicta facessas.

3) With *ne*: only Pers. 175, *potin ne moneas*.

4) With *ut ne* (8): only in Plautus and chiefly in the phrase
potin ut molestus ne sis, viz. Epid. 63; Cist. 465; Men. 627; Merc.
779; Pers. 287; Truc. 897; Bacch. 751, *potin ut ne parcas mihi*;
Merc. 441, *potin ut ne licitere*.

Besides *potin*, we find also *potis est ut*: Bacch. 35, *potis est ut*

¹ Durham, p. 69 f.

taceas; Eun. 263, si potis est ut parasiti Gnathonici vocentur. Also *potest ut ne*: Pseud. 633, potest ut alii arbitrentur et ut ne credam tibi; and *fieri potest ne, ut ne*: Poen. 1251, si id fieri possit, ne indigna indignis di darent; Ad. 626, fieri potis est ut ne qua exeat? And. 699, si poterit fieri ut ne pater credat. These last I regard as purely formal extensions of the common type, *potin ut ne*. Expressions of the general type under discussion are practically confined to Plautus (30). Terence has but 4 examples; Afran. 1.

12. With *Optimum Est, Aequom Est, Oportet, Decet, Tempus Est*, etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of substantive clauses with the above expressions is indicated by such passages as Aul. 567, optimum est loces; Most. 724, sic decet, morem geras; Cato, Agr. 14, 1, haec faciat oportet; Pacuv. 32, et aequom et rectum est quod postulas: iurati cernant. Cf. also Cato, Agr. 5, 1, haec erunt vilici officia: disciplina bona utatur; feriae serventur.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (11).

optimum est (4): Asin. 448, adeam optimumst; Aul. 567 (cited above); Men. 947, sein quid faciam optimumst? Rud. 377, capillum promittam optimumst.

melius est (3): Merc. 497, meliust sanus sis (the reading of A, followed by Lindsay). Also with *quam*, viz. Men. 832, quid mihi meliust quam med adsimulem insanire? Rud. 328, quid mihi melius est quam hic opperiar erum?

oportet: only Cato, Agr. 14, 1 (cited above) and 21, 5, idem trapetum oportet accomodet. Elsewhere in Early Latin, *oportet* takes the infinitive; see p. 393.

decet: besides Most. 724 (cited above) I have noted only Poen. 21, decet animo aequo nunc stent.

2) With *ut* (23).

optimum est (3): Aul. 582, hoc mihi factust optimum, ut ted auferam; Pseud. 185; Trin. 485, cogites id optimum esse tute uti sis optimum.

tempus est: M. G. 72, videtur tempus esse ut eamus; 1101; cf. H. T. 667, ita tempus fert ut cupiam (*fert* is Bentley's accepted emendation for *est* of the MSS.).

¹ Durham, p. 71 ff.

melius est (4): Aul. 76, neque quicquam meliust quam ex me ut unam faciam litteram; Pseud. 1121, neque quicquamst melius quam ut hoc pultem; Rud. 220, quid mihi meliust quam a corpore vitam ut secludam? 1189.

bonum est: Poen. 45, bonum factum quisque ut meminerit.

aequom: Rud. 1230, aequom videtur tibi ut dicam?

iustum est: Bacch. 994, iustum est ut serviat.

par videtur: Bacch. 139, non par videtur ut siet.

ex tua re est: Pseud. 336, ex tua re est ut ego emoriar; 338; Aul. 154; cf. And. 546, in rem est ut fiant; Hec. 834.

ius: Aul. 747, si ius est ut istuc excusare possies.

officium (4): Pers. 616, scio ego officium ut eloquar; Most. 27; Pseud. 913; And. 168, tuomst officium has ut adsimules nuptias. Cf. the use of *partis*, 'role' in Phor. 835; 836, with following *ut*-clause.

3) With *ne*: only Aul. 587, servi facinus ('duty') frugi ne morae molestiaeque imperium erile habeat.

13. With *Opus Est*, *Usus Est*, *Necesse Est*.¹

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause with these expressions is illustrated by Lucretius, iii, 593, fateare, necesse est, 'You must admit; ' originally, 'Admit! You must.'

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*: only Poen. 1244, patronus sim necesse est; Merc. 1004, nil opust resciscat, an analogical extension of *opus est resciscat*; cf. *nolo abeas* after *volo abeas*; p. 216.

2) With *ut* (11).

opus est (5): Poen. 1421, hic opus est ut maneat; Truc. 328, opus est ut lavem; 500, opust aegram ut te adsimules; Pseud. 740; Phor. 204, opus est ut sis.

necesse est: Eun. 969, necesse est ut subveniam; Enn. Sat. 481.

usus est (4): M. G. 1132, nunc ad me ut veniat usust; Epid. 167, usust ut pudeat; Phor. 505, neque umquam usus venit ut conflictaret; H. T. 81.

14. With Verbs of Hindering, Preventing, etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. We can only conjecture the original paratactic usage that has given rise to the subjunctive with *ne* and *ut ne* after verbs

¹ Durham, p. 74 f.

of hindering. Possibly the usage began in combination with imperatives, e.g. *eum prohibe; ne adveniat*, whence easily, 'prevent him from coming.'

b) FORM.

1) With *ne* (10).

prohibeo (4): Men. 794, *prohibere ad cenam ne promittat postules neu quemquam accipiat*; Trin. 87, *qui prohibere me potes ne suspicer?* Poen. 399; Eun. 808, *tun me prohibeas ne tangam?*

deterreo (4): Truc. 929, *hau detertere potes ne amet*; Phor. 3, *detertere ne scribat parat*; Hec. 27.

absterreo: Most. 420, *ut absterres ne intro iret*.

in manu est (involving the idea of preventing): Hec. 493, *tibi in manust ne fiat*.

In Most. 539, the idea of preventing is conveyed by *occurro* in *nisi quid occurro ne resciscat*, 'unless I am beforehand with something to prevent his finding out.'

2) With *ut ne*: only Trin. 104, *est atque non est mihi in manu; quin dicant, non est; merito ut ne dicant, id est*; where *est mihi in manu* involves the idea of preventing.

3) With *qui ne*: only Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 140, *haud facilest defensu qui ne comburantur*.

4) With the simple subjunctive: Pseud. 206, *prohibet faciant quod nolint* (bracketed by some editors). Explanation is difficult.

15. With Verbs of Deserving.¹

a) ORIGIN. I quote from Durham, l.c.: "Apparently no genuine instance is preserved of an original use of the substantive clause with *mereo* and kindred verbs, but the jussive origin seems well established by the occurrence of the negative *ne* (e.g. Men. 1100, *promeruisti ut nequid ores*). . . . Probably an original use would be something like *hoc mihi dones; merui*; or *ut hanc coronam accipias; meruisti*; i.e. 'just take this crown! you have earned it.'" In support of this theory of origin, may be urged the fact that in the great majority of cases of a substantive clause with verbs of deserving, the governing verb is in the perfect. But assuming that the construction began in the way suggested, its extension to the present would naturally follow.

¹ Durham, p. 75 f.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*: no instance.

2) With *ut* (14).

mereo, mereor (10): Capt. 744, *aliter ut dicam meres*; Men. 359; Poen. 1407, *ego te meruisse ut pereas scio*; Hec. 760, *meritus est ut commodem*; Turp. 85, *meres ut diligare*.

commereo: Hec. 580, *commerui ut caperet*.

dignus sum: only M. G. 1140, *non sum dignus ut figam palum in parietem*.

promereo: Epid. 442, *promerui ut mihi omnis mortalis agere deceat gratias*. Cf. also Pers. 496, *tuom promeritumst ut faciam*.

3) With *ut ne*: Men. 1100, cited above under a.

16. With *Quid Est Quod*; *Nihil Est Quod*; etc.¹

a) ORIGIN. I quote from Durham, l.c.: "These expressions are a development of relative clauses of purpose.² . . . In accordance with this theory, *quid est quod metuas* originally meant, 'what is there for you to fear?' whence naturally, 'what reason is there for you to fear?' 'why is it that you fear?' To the Roman mind, *quod* apparently came to be felt as an interrogative conjunction. This paved the way for expressions of the type, *quid est quod abeas*? where *quod* obviously could not have been a pronoun, or the dependent clause one of purpose. These last are therefore secondary in origin and an extension of the original purpose type. That such clauses were distinctly felt as causal, seems clear, not merely from the context in which they occur, but also from the answer given in Amph. 502, *quid istuc negoti est quod abeas?:: haud quod tui me distaedeat*."

b) RANGE OF USE.

1) *Quid est quod* (10): Amph. 502; Capt. 541, *quid istuc est quod meos te dicam fugitare oculos*? Cure. 166, *quid est quod voces Palinurum*? Rud. 628, *quid sit expedi (quod tu) multues*; 638; Poen. 867; H. T. 901, *quid est quod amplius simuletur*? Hec. 676.

2) *Nihil est quod* (7); *non est quod*: Asin. 146, *quod (quid, codd.) suscenseam ipsi nil est*; so Phor. 361; Mere. 317, *nil est quod tu mihi suscenseas*; H. T. 175, *nil est quod vereare*; 834; Lucil. 257, *non est quod quaeras neque labores*; Capt. 741.

¹ Durham, p. 77 f.

² A jussive development.

3) *Est quod* (6): Trin. 310, est quod gaudeas; 1166; Rud. 516, bonam est quod habeas gratiam; Merc. 502, tibi quod rideas magis est quam ut lamentere; Aul. 203; Hec. 741, est magnam gratiam quod tibi habeam.

4) *Nil scio quod*: Capt. 842, nil scio quod gaudeam.

To the same influence, probably, we should assign Aul. 92, ne causae quid sit quod te quisquam quaeritet.

17. Miscellaneous Expressions.¹

a) With *memento*: Cas. 823, ut subdola sis, memento; Afran. 194, illud memento, ne quid imprudentius blateres.

b) *Restat*: Phor. 586, ut egrediar, id restat, 'it remains for me to go out;' Hec. 300, quid restat nisi ut fiam miser?

c) *Satis est*: Cato, Agr. 69, 2, tepeat satis est; Bacch. 491, satin ut nescias, also possibly belongs here.

d) Expressions of exempting and refraining: Trin. 293, hisce de artibus gratiam facio ne colas neve imbuas; M. G. 576, gratiam fecit ne iratus esset; Trin. 314, ne penetrarem, neu irem, neu parerem parsi; Stich. 117, ne id faciat temperat.

e) *Causa est*: Capt. 257, non iusta causa est ut vos servem? taken by Durham, i.e. as a negative interrogative extension of *ut serves*; *causa est*, 'just watch! there's reason for it.'

f) Note also the loose use of substantive *ut*-clauses, following *nisi*: Cas. 952, quid nunc agam nescio nisi ut famulos imiter; Most. 663; Trin. 718, quid ego nunc agam nisi ut sarcinam constringam? Eun. 74, quid agas? nisi ut te redimas quam minumo; Pseud. 1101, non edepol scio, nisi ut observemus quo eat.

PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE USED WITH FUTURE FORCE IN SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

Just as in the case of independent volitive subjunctives, so also in their dependent use as substantive clauses, the perfect tense is occasionally used with future force in Early Latin. Thus: Trin. 520, dico ne siris; Aul. 99, praedico tibi ne intromiseris; Capt. 791, eminor interminorque nequis mihi obstiterit; Aul. 611, quaeso ut prohibessis; Capt. 319, optestor ne faxint; with *fac, facite*, we find the perfect only in deponents and passives, e.g. Amph. 979, fac com-

¹ Durham, p. 77.

mentus sis; Pseud. 190, fac sit delatum mihi frumentum; Men. 992, facite ablatus siet; Capt. 736, facite deductus siet; Men. 867; Bacch. 96; Poen. 580; Asin. 90; Amph. 971; 981; Aul. 273; Most. 400. Frequently with *cave* (38),¹ e.g. Amph. 608, cave responderis; Aul. 90, cave intromiseris; 618, cave tu illi fidelis fueris; Cas. 332, cave feceris; Epid. 439, cave rettuleris; Merc. 113; cave praevorteris; Most. 401, cave siveris; Trin. 555, cave dixeris; H. T. 826, cave admiratus sis; Naev. Com. 47, cave faxis; *cave ne* only Aul. 584, cave ne immutassis nomen; Poen. 445, cautios ne obiexim moram; Bacch. 597.

Besides these instances of the perfect referring to the future, the perfect is also employed as a true present perfect, e.g. Most. 966, vide ne devorteris; Pseud. 1096, vide ne sit contechinatus quidpiam; Hec. 841; M. G. 149; 187; but this use is rare.

CONNECTING NEGATIVES IN SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED
FROM THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

The connecting negative in these clauses is regularly *neve* (*neu*), viz. in Epid. 164, dicam ne hinc exambulet neve veniat; Bacch. 521, exorabo ne noceat neu quid ei suscenseat; 689, exoravi tibi ne noceat neu quid ob eam rem suscenseat; Men. 270, caverò ne tu delinquas neve ego irascar; 795; 1006, opsecro te operam mihi ut des neu sinas in me fieri tantam iniuriam; Amph. 1037, quaeso ut mi adsis neve abeas; Merc. 331, huic persuadere ut illam vendat neve det matri suae; Trin. 293, his de artibus gratiam facio ne colas neve imbuas ingenium; CIL, i, 196, 10, sacerdos nequis vir eset, neve pecuniam quisquam eorum comoinem habuisse velet (repeated four times in the same paragraph); And. 291, te obtestor ne abs te hanc segreges neu deseras; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, sic in animo habeto uti ne cupide emas neve opera tua parcas visere et ne satis habeas semel circumire; 5, 6, terram cariosam cave ne ares neve plostrum neve pecus impellas; 31, 2; 37, 4; 38, 2; Frag. (Jord.), 22, 2, mihi curae est ne quid advorsi eveniat neve haec laetitia nimis luxuriose eveniat; Trin. 314; Ad. 798.

The only exceptions to the foregoing principle are: Curc. 218, sententiam ut qui me nili faciat nec salvom velit; Poen. 489, faciat ut semper sacrificem nec unquam litem; Hec. 729, videndumst ne impetrem aut ne quid faciam; H. T. 964, cepi rationem ut neque egeres

¹ Full material above, p. 232.

neque posses perdere; Most. 418; Hec. 595, curast ut ne longinquitas aetatis obstet mortemve quis expectet. *Et ne*: Cato, Agr. 1, 1; 32, 2.

Absence of Introductory Particles in Subordinate Clauses.

Attention has been called above (p. 209 ff.) to the fact that many of the subjunctives which I take as subordinate are by others regarded as independent. In fact all those instances of the subjunctive without *ut* which I have classified above as "substantive clauses" are by Morris¹ taken as independent uses. Against this attitude there are serious objections.² Thus in the Amphitruo prologue, v. 8 ff.:

Et uti bonis vos vestrosque omnis nuntii
Me adficere voltis, ea adferam, ea uti nuntiem,
Quae maxime in rem vostram communem sient,

adferam is taken by Morris as independent. It is true that there is no subordinating sign, but evidently *adferam* is logically identical with the preceding infinitive *adficere* and the following *uti nuntiem*, — 'You wish me to bless you with good tidings, to bring you and to announce to you things that make for your common good.' It is clearly impossible, I think, to conceive *adferam* as possessing an independent value here. The same is true of Amph. 11, vos quidem id iam scitis concessum et datum mi esse ab dis aliis nuntiis praesim; Asin. 644, istud facias quod faciamus nobis suades; Amph. 257, velatis manibus orant ignoscamus peccatum suom. There is also special difficulty in the case of imperfects like Stich. 177, hoc nomen repperi eo quia paupertas fecit ridiculus forem. If *forem* be an independent subjunctive, the first question is what it means. Who says *forem*? Gelasimus (the speaker in the passage) cannot say it, and it is equally impossible that a personified Paupertas should say it. It must, therefore, I think, be clear that *forem* is not an independent subjunctive, but a dependent one, — the object of *fecit*, — 'poverty made me take to jesting.' Cf. also Stich. 624, dixi equidem in carcerem ires; Trin. 591, tandem impetravi abiret; M. G. 54, at peditastelli quia erant, sivi viverent. Here if we take *ires*, *abiret*, and *viverent* as independent, we get a kind of subjunctive totally different from anything else familiar to us. My explanation therefore is that

¹ Independent Subjunctive in Plautus; Principles and Methods in Syntax, p. 113 ff.

² For a fuller statement of these, see Bennett, Critique of Recent Subjunctive Theories (Cornell Studies, ix, p. 66 ff.).

they are modelled on expressions like *dico eas*; 'go, I tell you to;' *sino, vivant*, 'let them live, I allow it.' Even in expressions of the latter type it seems necessary to recognize subordination, since a *dixi ires* would hardly have arisen until in *dico eas* the *eas* was felt as subordinate.

I pass to examples of which the following is a typical illustration: Merc. 107, *eam me advexisse nolo resciscat pater*; Pseud. 436, *vetus nolo faciat*; so also Cas. 233, *nolo ames*; Pers. 245 (full material at page 216). Now if we here take *ames* as independent, we get the astounding nonsense: 'love her; I don't want you to.' I have therefore above *loc. cit.* explained these expressions as modelled on *volo resciscat*; *volo ames*. Cf. also Merc. 1004, *nihil opust resciscat*, which presumably follows the analogy of *opus est resciscat*.

If the explanation of *nolo ames* and *nihil opust resciscat* be correct, it involves conclusions of far-reaching importance. At the time when *nolo ames* came into existence in the way suggested, *ames* in *volo ames* must have already passed the stage of independence and have come to be felt as an object clause. So *nihil opust resciscat* could not have arisen until in *opus est resciscat* the *resciscat* had come to be felt as a dependent substantive clause.

But if this is so, one may well query whether any of the examples of so-called paratactic subjunctives in Plautus are anything more than vestiges of an original parataxis. It seems certain that, for the subjunctive, the paratactic stage had been passed centuries before Plautus, just as it had well-nigh disappeared in the Greek of Homer's day. A very few cases occur which may, perhaps, be vindicated as paratactic; but in the main it seems clear that for Plautus and Terence, as well as for Cicero and the later Latin, the great body of subjunctive expressions of the type claimed by Morris as independent (and paratactic) were really felt to be subordinate and dependent.¹

¹ In his *Principles and Methods*, Morris replies to the strictures which I (in my *Critique*) had made upon the attitude above criticised. In this reply he shifts the ground to the question whether the subjunctives in controversy are properly to be called paratactic. But my criticism was not primarily intended to discuss the subject of the nature of parataxis. It was directed essentially to the discussion of the question whether the expressions involved were dependent or independent. I was constrained to decide in favor of their dependence. Whether dependence is consistent with parataxis (as ordinarily understood) is doubtful.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE DELIBERATIVE.¹A. With *Quin*.

a) ORIGIN. The origin of these clauses is indicated by Amph. 559, *quin loquar, numquam me potes detertere*;² cf. Cic. Epist. ii, 17, 1, *quin decedam, nulla causa est*; literally, "Why shouldn't I speak? You can't stop me;" "Why shouldn't I withdraw? There's no reason." It is true that independent deliberatives introduced by *quin* are rare (see p. 183), but this circumstance is hardly of great significance in view of the many dependent *quin*-clauses that naturally lend themselves to this explanation.

In Classical Philology, iii, p. 408 ff., Fowler takes a different view of these *quin*-clauses, denying that *quin* ever had interrogative force, and explaining it as indefinite (= *qui* + *-ne*, asseverative). But Fowler's contention seems to ignore the Plautine *mirum quin*; while it likewise involves the arbitrary conjecture of *quin* for *quia* in Merc. 191, as well as an unnatural interpretation in Stich. 576, *quin vocasti hominem ad cenam? : Nequid adveniens perderem*.

b) RANGE OF USE. The substantive clause with *quin* developed from the deliberative occurs with:

nulla causa est, numquid causae est, etc. (16): Cas. 1003, *nulla causa est quin verberes*; And. 600, *quid causae est quin proficiscar*? Aul. 755, *haud causificor quin eam habeam*; Trin. 1188, *numquid causae est quin uxorem ducam*?

dubito (6): Poen. 881, *quid dubitas quin faciat*? Africanus Minor (Meyer), p. 213, *eumne quisquam dubitet quin idem fecerit*?

non (haud) *dubium est* (5, all in Terence): And. 530, *haud dubiumst quin possim*.

contineo (4): Rud. 1172, *contineri quin complectar non queo*; Eun. 859.

deterreo (2): Amph. 559, *quin loquar numquam me potes detertere*.

prohibeo (3): Amph. 1051, *neque prohibebunt quin sic faciam*.

retineo, teneo (4): Trin. 641, *retineri nequeo quin dicam*; Cas. 239, *vix teneor quin dicam*; Curc. 228.

¹ Durham, p. 85 ff.

² See Kienitz, *De quin particulae . . . usu*, 1878; Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik* 4, p. 594.

- comprimo: Most. 203, vix comprimor quin involem illi.
reprimor (2): M. G. 1368, vix reprimor quin te manere iubeam.
moro (4): Bacch. 340, numquam te morabitur quin habeas.
mora (3, all in Terence): And. 971, nec mora est quin ducam.
remoror: M. G. 920, si non nos materiarius remoratur quod opus
quin det (reading, with Durham, p. 87, *quin* for *qui* of the MSS.).
depello: Trin. 640, neque depellar quin rumori serviam.
numquid vis (3): Amph. 970, numquid vis quin abeam?
alieno: Amph. 399, me alienabis numquam quin noster siem.
vinco: Stich. 756, numquam vinces quin pruriam.
non possum (9): Trin. 705, non possum quin exclamem; H.
T. 761.
non potest fieri: Trin. 729, nullo modo potest fieri quin dos detur.
fallit: Hee. 728, nec me fallit quin sit.
abesse non potest (2, both from C. Gracchus): Frag. (Meyer, p.
230), abesse non potest quin dicamini; p. 229.
est in manu (= possum prohibere): Trin. 105, quin dicant non est
(in manu).
nequeo (4): M. G. 1342, nequeo quin fleam.
recuso: Cure. 164, haud recusem quin mihi male sit.
intermitto: Cato, Agr. 38, 2, ne intermittas quin semper siet.
facio (3): Amph. 398, numquam facies quin sim Sosia; M. G.
283; 474.
audeo: Asin. 25, ut non audeam quin promam omnia.
negotium: Capt. 525, neque negotiumst quin male occidam op-
petamque pestem; cf. Morris, ad loc., "nor is there anything to
hinder me from dying." This sense of *negotium* is common.
abstineo (2): Bacch. 915, abstinere quin attingas non queas.
In the two following the notion is to prevent by reward or en-
treaty: Cas. 504, conduci non possum quin comparem magnum
malum; Amph. 159, nec quisquam (qui impediat) quin omnes
deputent.
Peculiar are the following: Aul. 111, veri simile non est hominem
pauperem pauxillum parvi facere quin nummum petat; Vid. 88, quin
accedat faenus id non postulo; Trin. 587, (nullo modo) aequom vide-
tur quin quod peccarim mihi obsit; Amph. 1106, non metuo quin
meae uxori latae suppetiae sient; Enn. Trag. 245, certatio est nulla

quin monstrum siet; Phor. 971, neque sis veritus quin faceres; Hec. 398, scio nemini aliter suspectum (=dubitatum) fore quin putent.

The great bulk of the foregoing examples are perfectly clear and intelligible. In many of them we plainly see vestiges of an original parataxis. Others are manifestly extensions which have grown up under the influence of more primitive uses, after the construction had become generally prevalent. Some of the examples last cited are certainly far remote from their first source.

Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gram. § 510) does not regard the *quin*-clause with verbs of hindering as of deliberative origin, but apparently as a dependent purpose clause, like clauses introduced by *quominus*; but the fact that *quin*-clauses are dependent only on negative expressions or interrogative expressions implying a negative is not adequately accounted for on this hypothesis. It is accounted for on the theory of a deliberative origin.

B. With *cur* (*quor*).

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause introduced by *cur* developed from the deliberative is seen in And. 103, quid obstat quor non fiant?

b) RANGE OF USE. But few instances of this usage are found in Early Latin. In addition to the Andria passage just cited I have noted only Stich. 52, nequest quor studeam has nuptias mutarier; Acc. 147, quid est cur ausis? Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 150, non est cur velis vivere; Poen. 533, non iusta causa quor curratur? Titin. 65, quid ego feci quem pauperetis? should, I believe, read *quor pauperetis*.

C. With *Quam ob Rem*.

a) ORIGIN. This is seen in Hec. 453, quam causam dicam quam ob rem non redducam? Further examples are: Hec. 695; And. 382; Naev. Com. 128; Most. 987, quid merear, quam ob rem mentiar? This last may have been paratactic, but Naev. Com. 39, ultro meretur quam ob rem ametur, is purely analogical. Other examples with *mereo*, *promereo*, are: Amph. 1142, haud promeruit quam ob rem vitio vorteres; Stich. 82, nil quam ob rem id faciam meruisse.

D. With *Qua Causa*.

Under this head belong Men. 490, *quid merui qua me causa perderes?* H. T. 989, *inventast causa qua te expellerent*. The second of these is an analogical extension.

E. With *Quapropter*.

Amph. 815, *quid ego feci qua istaec propter dicantur mihi?*

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE OPTATIVE.

1. With Verbs of Wishing, Desiring, Preferring, etc.¹

a) **ORIGIN.** The origin of the substantive clause developed from the optative is clearly seen in expressions like Truc. 473, *inveniat volo*, originally paratactic, 'may he find; I desire it'; Cas. 559, *veniat, velim*, 'may he come; I should like (him to)'; Poen. 289, *amet malim*, 'may he love; I should prefer (that he should).'

b) **FORM.**

1) Without *ut* (45). This is very common in the early period, particularly in Plautus. With *vellem, malo, mavellem*, we find only the simple subjunctive, never an *ut*-clause. With *volo, velim, nolo*, both forms occur. Examples:

volo (9): Pers. 293, *eveniant volo tibi quae optas*; 832, *obsit volo*; Poen. 279, *at ego elixus sis volo*; Truc. 473, *inveniat volo*; Pseud. 1122; Rud. 1332; Trin. 372; Epid. 463; Naev. Com. 37, *diu vivat volo*.

velim (20): Present: Cas. 559, *veniat velim*; so also Aul. 670; Most. 1074; Poen. 1288; Pseud. 1061; Cas. 234, *vera dicas velim*; Rud. 511, *velim vomas*; 877, *verum sit velim*; Phor. 449, *velim facias*; Ad. 681, *velim ames*; Turp. 26, *credas mihi velim*.

Perfect: Bacch. 334, *mihi dederit velim*; Poen. 570, *deciderint velim*; Ad. 519, *se defetigarit velim*; Poen. 1206, *velim de me dixerit*; Rud. 662.

vellem (4): Poen. 1066, *viverent vellem*; Ad. 532, *vellem mos esset*; Stich. 312, *vellem hae fores erum fugissent*; Afran. 308, *vellem intervenissem*.

Other forms of *volo* (4): Amph. 9, *voltis ea adferam*; 56, *utrum sit an non voltis*; Cato, Agr. 43, 2, *si voles crescant*; so 46, 2.

¹ Durham, p. 92 ff.

malo: Pseud. 209, at taceas malo; Afran. 264, di te mactas-sint malo; H. T. 928.

malim (3): Poen. 289, amet malim; 1150, facias modo malim; 1184, malim istuc aliis videatur.

mavellem: only Bacch. 1047, mavellem foret.

Other forms of *malo*: Ad. 780, mavis cerebrum dispergam?

nolo: Merc. 107, nolo resciscat; And. 819, nolo videat; so also Eun. 906. These expressions are analogical, being modelled on *videat volo*; cf. p. 216 f.

satius est: Cato, Agr. 54, 1, pascantur satius erit.

exopto: Pseud. 938, si exoptem quantum dignus es tantum dent.

In several cases, verbs of the above classes are followed by *quam* with the simple subjunctive: viz. Asin. 121, moriri mavolet quam non perfectum reddat; Cas. 111, hercle me suspendio quam eius potior fias satiust mortuom; Asin. 810, emori me malim quam non indicem; Aul. 661, emortuom me mavelim quam non dem. The negative in the first and last two examples shows that we probably have to do with secondary extensions, since a *non indicem* or *non dem* in an original use would be irregular. The natural negative would be *ne*.

2) With *ut* (75).

volo (6): Bacch. 77, ut ille te videat volo; Pers. 696, ut requiram volo; Rud. 768; Most. 1098; Eun. 192.

velim: Most. 632, velim ut uno nummo plus petas.

Other forms of *volo* (15): Asin. 720, opta id quod ut contingat vis; Cist. 119, numquid me vis? :: ut valeas; so Epid. 512; Men. 328; Phor. 151; Pseud. 276, (voltis) ut male sit mihi; Amph. 8; Cato, Agr. 99, si voles ut integrae sint; 64, 1; Stat. 162, ut devomas volt.

malim: Trin. 762, malim ut verum dicas; Poen. 1184, malim videatur quam ut conlaudes; Truc. 742, mortuom me quam ut patiar mavelim.

nolo: Lucil. 453, ut publicanus fiam, id nolo (apparently the only instance of *nolo ut*, except Hyg. Fab. 189, 9; Firm. Mat., De Err. 8, 3).

opto (4): always with *ut* in Early Latin; H. T. 756, optabit ut abeat; Ad. 874, ut vivat optant; M. G. 669; 1038.

quaeso (15): always with *ut* in early Latin; Amph. 720,

deos quaeso ut pariam; Cas. 390, deos quaeso ut sortitio eveniat; And. 487, deos quaeso ut sit superstes; Ad. 491, haec primum ut fiant deos quaeso; Naev. 95, quaeso ut adimant.

exopto: Men. 817, exopto ut fiam; Rud. 874; Hec. 490, exopto ut vitam exigat.

precor (9): Rud. 640, te digna ut eveniant precor; Enn. Ann. 30, precor ut visas; Cato, Agr. 134, 2, precor ut sies volens; 139; 141, 2, precor ut prohibessis; Pacuv. 297, precor uti verruncent; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201; Afran. 83, ut fortunassint precor.

comprecor: Ad. 699, comprecare deos ut accersas.

spero: Cist. 596, deos spero:: eosdem ego — uti abeas; Rud. 629, si speras ut sit. By analogy also

spes: Bacch. 369, nemo nisi quem spes reliquere omnes esse ut frugi possiet.

veneror (7): Rud. 257, veneror ut eximat, ut adiuvet; 305; 1349; Poen. 278; 950.

oro (3): Trin. 57, oro ut suppetat; Asin. 783.

invoco: Most. 529, (invoco) ut det; Acc. Praet. 6, invoco ut verruncent.

expeto: Cas. 430, expetivisse ne ea mihi daretur atque ut illi nuberet.

praeopto: Trin. 648, praeoptavisti uti praeponeres.

adiuro: Bacch. 777, per omnis deos adiuro ut lacerentur?

obtestor: Asin. 18, ita ted obtestor ut tibi superstes uxor siet atque ut pestem oppetas.

dico ('pray'): Rud. 1345, dic ut exradicet.

satiust est: Cist. 662, quam ut sinam satiust mihi interire.

magis in mentem est (= *malo*): Bacch. 130, magis in mentemst mihi ut haec concuret.

3) With *ne* (3): Rud. 1067, ne videas velim; M. G. 1086; Cas. 431.

4) With *ut ne*: M. G. 1050, quid vis?:: ut ne spernas; Rud. 629.

Perfect with Aoristic Force, Referring to the Future, in Substantive Clauses Developed from the Optative. This occurs: Bacch. 334, mihi dederit velim; Poen. 570, deciderint velim; 950, deos veneror ut siritis; Cas. 396, quaeso ut tua sors effugerit; Rud. 305, Venerem veneremur ut nos adiuverit; Cato, Agr. 141, 2, precor ut prohibessis,

uti siris; Afran. 83, uti fortunassint precor; 264, di te mactassint malo.

Besides this the perfect occurs as a true perfect in Poen. 950, deos veneror ut venerim; Ad. 519, se defetigarit velim; Poen. 1206, velim de me quid dixerit; Rud. 662, velim malas edentaverit.

2. With Verbs of Fearing.¹

a) ORIGIN. Kühner (Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, p. 823) followed by Lattmann, (De Conjunctivo Latino, p. 89 f.) regards clauses introduced by *ut* and *ne* after verbs of fearing as indirect questions. According to this theory, *timeo ut veniat* meant originally, 'I fear how he will come;' and *timeo ne veniat* meant, 'I fear whether he will not come.' But this last involves the assumption of a meaning for *ne* not found in the literature.

It seems much more natural to explain *ut*- and *ne*- clauses with expressions of fearing as dependent optatives; i.e. to assume that *timeo ne veniat* meant originally, 'may he not come; I am afraid (he will);' and *timeo ut veniat*, 'may he only come; I am afraid (he won't).' Cf. the French, *je crains qu'il ne vienne*, originally, 'may he not come; I am afraid (he will).' For the use of *ut* with independent optatives, see p. 193; and for support of the theory of origin advocated for these clauses, cf. Bottek, Ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Konjunktivs in lat. Nebensätzen, p. 19; Cauer, Grammatica Militans, p. 119 ff.; Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, 261; 262; 307.

Hale, in Hale-Buck. Lat. Gramm. 502, 4, regards the dependent clause with expressions of this sort as of volitive origin. But this view seems psychologically less natural than the one above advocated. A state of fear is quite compatible with a wish, but hardly with a peremptory order.

b) FORM.

1) With *ne* (136).

metuo (77).

Present tense: Pseud. 1028, metuo ne erus redeat; Poen. 883, ego hoc metuo ne me perduim; Men. 989, metuo ne sero veniam; Trin. 1042, metuo ne aliam rem occipiat loqui; H. T. 808, nec quicquam magis metuo quam ne extrudar; Eun. 140, metuat ne relinquam; 450; 611, metuo fratrem ne intus sit; 855, hanc metui ne me criminaretur;

¹ Durham, p. 98 ff.

Phor. 491; Hec. 337; Bacch. 1173, non metuo nequid mihi doleat; Aul. 609, non metuo ne quisquam inveniatur; Cist. 495; Aul. 61, metuo ne mi verba duit neu persentiscat; M. G. 996, metuo ne obsint neve opstent.

Perfect as aorist: Bacch. 38, metuo lusciniolae ne defuerit cantio; Men. 861, metuo ne quid male faxit; Pers. 478, nec metuo nequis mihi in iure abiurassit; M. G. 526, metuo nequid infuscaverit.

Present perfect: Most. 550, metuo ne techinae meae perpetuo perierint; 542, metuo ne indaudiverit; M. G. 428; Asin. 286; Cas. 304; 575; Titin. 107, metuo ne fecerim.

Imperfect and pluperfect: Cas. 908; Poen. 1378; Pseud. 912; metuebam ne abisses; M. G. 722, metuere ne diffregisset crura.

timeo (10): M. G. 1348, metuo et timeo ne hoc tandem propalam fiat; Truc. 774, timeo ne malefacta sint inventa omnia; And. 269, hoc timet ne deseras se; H. T. 434, timet ne adaucta sit; 664, timui ne esses; Eun. 160; Lucil. 593, timeo ne accuser; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, timerem nequid mali fortuna moliretur.

timidus sum: Hec. 734, timida sum ne obsiet.

formido (7): Cist. 673, quae in tergum ne veniant male formido; Poen. 378; Most. 511, formido ne me opprimat; Catulus (Baehrens), p. 276, ne teneamur formido.

adformido: Bacch. 1078, adformido ne pereat neu corrumpatur.

paveo: M. G. 904, nequid peccetis paveo; Pers. 626.

vereor (21): Present tense: Capt. 308, non verear ne imperet; M. G. 943, haud verear ne pervincamur; And. 73, vereor ne adportet; Phor. 585; Hec. 412, vereor ne intellegat; Ad. 684.

Perfect as aorist: H. T. 198, nil magis vereor quam ne quid faxit.

Present perfect: Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; Rud. 390, eam veretur ne perierit; Eun. 81, vereor ne tulerit neve acceperit; H. T. 231, vereor ne corrupta sit.

Imperfect and pluperfect: And. 582, veritus sum ne faceres; Turp. 112, veritus sum ne limasses.

sollicitor: Ad. 36, sollicitor ne aut alserit aut ceciderit.

Also with nouns denoting fear, danger, etc.: *periculum* (5): Capt. 91, quod mihi ne eveniat periculumst; M. G. 1151; Asin. 388; only in Plautus. *metus*: M. G. 1233, metus me macerat ne sententiam mutant. *cura*: Truc. 455, quantast cura dolus ne occidat!

Even where no word suggesting fear is expressed, we often find a *ne*-clause dependent upon the general idea of fearing involved in the context. Instances of this use are rare outside of Plautus. Examples: M. G. 597, *sinite me prius perspectare, ne insidiae sient*; Truc. 736, *discant, dum mihi adcentare liceat, ni oblitus siem* (with *ni* for *ne*); Aul. 39, *aurum inspicere volt ne subreptum siet*, 'for fear that it has been stolen'; 82, *ego intus servem? an ne quis aedis auferat?* 647, *ne inter tunicas habeas*; Capt. 127, *ad captivos meos visam, ne quippiam turbaverint*; Cure. 558, *venit in mentem mihi, ne tarpezita exsulatum abierit, argentum ut petam*; Men. 161, *ne te uxor sequatur respectas identidem*; Pers. 77, *visam hesternas reliquias, ne quis obreptaverit*; Pseud. 654, *huc quidem herele haud ibis intro, ni quid 'harpax' feceris*. Note here *ni* for *ne*, and the perfect with aoristic force. Rud. 896, *uxor me servat ne quid significem*; 1168, *non circumspexi ne quis inspectaret*; Trin. 146, *circumspicedum ne quis adsit arbiter*; Phor. 508, (*id dicis*) *ne parum leno sies*.

That these clauses do not denote purpose, is clear from the most superficial examination. In origin they were probably paratactic optatives. Yet that they contributed to the development of the purpose clause, is probable; see below, p. 255.

2) With *ut* (16).

metuo (10): Bacch. 762, *metuo ut possiem emolirier*; Cure. 464, *ornamenta metuo ut possim recipere*; Most. 465; M. G. 355; Pers. 319; And. 914, *metuo ut substet*; Hec. 257; Ad. 627; Lucil. 529, *metuo ut possit*; 898.

paveo: And. 349, *id paves ne ducas; tu autem ut ducas*.

vereor: And. 705, *ut satis sit vereor*; 277; Phor. 965, *vereor ut placari possit*; Hec. 101, *firmae vereor ut sint nuptiae*; Pacuv. 154, *ut queam vereor*.

3) With *ne non* (4): Cas. 575, *metuo ne non sit surda*; Pers. 686, *ne non sat esses leno, id metuebas*; H. T. 1017, *metuis ne non vincas*; Ad. 217, *metuisti ne non faeneraret*.

4) With *quo minus*: Hec. 630, *ne reveatur minus quo redeat* (to avoid ambiguity, owing to the preceding *ne*).

5) With *ni*: Men. 420, *hunc metuebam ni meae uxori renuntiaret*.

Connecting Negatives after Expressions of Fearing. The regular connective is *neve* (*neu*) (4): Aul. 61, *metuo ne verba duit neu per-*

sentiscat; Bacch. 1078, adformido ne pereat neu corrumpatur; M. G. 996, metuo ne obsint neve obstent; Eun. 81, vereor ne tulerit neve acceperit. In Ad. 36, *aut* occurs as connective, sollicitor ne alserit aut ceciderit.

Perfect with Aoristic Force, Referring to the Future. This occurs after expressions of fearing in the following instances: Bacch. 38, metuo lusciniolae ne defuerit cantio; Men. 861, metuo ne quid faxit; M. G. 526, metuo ne quid infuscaverit; Pers. 478, nec metuo nequis mihi in iure abiurassint; Pseud. 654, ni quid 'harpax' feceris; Truc. 736, ni oblitus siem; H. T. 198, nil magis vereor quam ne quid faxit.

The Perfect also occurs with frequency used as a true present perfect, e.g. Most. 550, metuo ne techinae perierint; M. G. 428, metuo ne nosmet perdiderimus; Merc. 380; Rud. 390; Truc. 774; H. T. 231, vereor ne corrupta sit; 434.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF PURPOSE.

The clause of purpose is probably partly volitive, partly optative in origin. Thus an original *tibi pecuniam do; ut¹ panem emas*, 'I give you money; just buy bread!' could naturally, as a result of the context, develop into the meaning, 'I give you money, that you may buy bread.'² So an original *eum custodite; ne pedem eferat!* would naturally come to mean, 'watch him, lest he stir a foot!' In many passages in Early Latin it is difficult to determine whether a *ne*-clause is a dependent clause of purpose or an independent prohibitive. The share of the optative in the development of the purpose clause is also probably quite as great as that of the volitive. Expressions like M. G. 597, sinite me prius perspectare, ne uspiam insidiae sient; 1137, circumspicite, ne quis adsit arbiter, show how easily an optative expression develops into one of purpose; and the meaning in practically all purpose clauses is entirely consistent with an optative origin. The *ne*-clause in the two passages just cited I interpret as dependent upon an implied notion of fear, 'look around, for fear lest.' Yet others doubtless may see in these and in the similar expressions collected at p. 254 fully developed purpose clauses.

¹ *Ut* is here the indefinite adverb, 'somehow,' 'just,' 'only'; see p. 164 f.

² Cf. the occasional use of the imperative in parataxis with identical force, e.g. Amph. 353, nunc abi sane! advenisse familiares dicito! = *abi ut dicas!*

In a very few instances we find purpose clauses without any introductory particle, e.g. Stich. 757, *date bibat*, originally 'give him! let him drink!' hence 'give him to drink!' Cato, Agr. 73, *dato bubus bibant omnibus*; 156, 6, *dato vini bibat quam minimum*; 157, 9, *dato edit*; *dato panem purum mafe faciat*; *dato bibat*. All of these point to an original parataxis. The two following examples are 'extensions' based on the original type: Curc. 313, *da obsorbeam*; Truc. 367, *cedo bibam*.¹

The preservation of these interesting relics is doubtless due to the frequency of their employment in the daily routine of the family life. To the same cause is to be attributed the equally primitive and equally interesting *da bibere*.

Relative clauses of purpose may be conceived to have originated in sentences like *tibi hunc librum do quem legas*, 'I give you this book; read which! (read it!); i.e. 'I give you this book to read.'

It is obvious that as a rule only those purpose clauses are of primitive origin in which the main clause and subordinate clause refer to different persons. Thus in a sentence like *pecuniam mutuatur ut panem emat, ut emat* cannot be explained as an original paratactic jussive. Such a use as that in the sentence just cited can be explained only as an extension of the original paratactic use (cf. p. 210 f.). Whenever a new syntactical category develops, it almost inevitably extends far beyond the boundaries of the territory in which it first came into being.

Classification of Purpose Clauses.

1. **Purpose clauses introduced by *ut* (542)**, e.g. Amph. 195, *me praemisit ut haec nuntiem*; and frequently in all authors of the early period.

The main clause occasionally contains *ita* anticipating the *ut* clause, e.g. Pseud. 579, *ita* ('with this in view') *paravi copias, ut facile vincam*; so Cato, Agr. 8, 2, *ita paret itaque conserat, uti quam sollertissimum habeat*; cap. 133.

Ut may even occur with comparatives. While *quo* is commoner

¹ Cf. Apuleius, Met. ii, 16, *porrigit bibam*, the only instance of this idiom that I have noted outside of Plautus and Cato. In Most. 373, we find *cedo ut bibam*, where, however, Bentley, followed by Leo and Lindsay, deletes *ut*.

in purpose clauses containing a comparative (see p. 261), yet *ut* occurs 14 times in such clauses, viz. Amph. 110, *ut rem teneatis rectius*; 142, *internosse ut nos possitis facilius*; Aul. 596; Capt. 33; 290; Cist. 636; Pers. 181; Acc. 281; 598; Cato, Agr. 103; 124; cap. 133; H. T. 681, *ut frugalior sim*; Phor. 533, *ut potior sit*.

There are 2 instances of *ut non*, viz. Stich. 588, *quid opust? : : hunc ut vocem, te non vocem*; And. 394, *ut non queat*. In both of these the negative is 'adhaerescens,' i.e. is closely associated with a single word, instead of modifying the clause as a whole.

As a rule the *ut*-clause connects itself with the verb of the main clause and expresses the motive of an actor; but in one instance it connects itself with a single word and denotes the adaptation of means to end, viz. Pacuv. 304, *satis habeam virium ut te ara arceam*.

2. Purpose clauses introduced by *ne* (254), e.g. Amph. 527, *ne legio persentiscat, clam redeundum est mihi, ne me uxorem praevortisse dicant prae re publica*; Aul. 1, *ne quis miretur, eloquar*; 113, *celo sedulo ne sciant*; Capt. 291, *Samiis vasis utitur ne Genius surripiat*; 456, *servate ne pedem eferat*. In all of these, the theory of an optative origin (see above, p. 255) seems at least as simple and natural as that of a volitive origin. In the other examples of the construction, the theory of a volitive origin, though often possible, is never necessary.

Occasionally the main clause contains *ita* anticipating the *ne*-clause, e.g. Capt. 737, *hunc me velle dicite, ita curarier ne qui deterrus huic sit*; so also Most. 920; Trin. 343; Cato, Agr. 3, 1.

In a few instances we find the perfect used with the force of the present, viz. Asin. 373, *tu cavebis ne me attingas, ne malo cum auspicio nomen commutaveris*; Cas. 627, *abscede ab ista ne quid mali faxit*; M. G. 333, *hic obsistam ne se subrepsit*; Truc. 523, *magis tritici opust granariis ne nos extinxit fames*. In Ad. 281, *istum absolvi-tote ne hoc permanet atque ego perierim, perierim* (like *oderim* and *noverim*) is probably to be regarded as denoting the state resulting from a completed act.

To be distinguished from these aorist perfects, are the following true present perfects: Asin. 698, *ne nequiquam dixeris, vahas*; the same expression also Bacch. 701; Most. 252; Cas. 569, *ne me nequiquam advocaverit*.

As in the later Latinity, so also in Early Latin, the instances are frequent in which the *ut*- or *ne*-clause gives the purpose, not of the fact stated, but of the speaker in making the statement, e.g. Epid. 702, quis est? :: amica, ut scias; 648; Curc. 715, ut scire possis libera haec est; Asin. 843, ut verum dicam, ea res me male habet; 235, ut scire possis; Poen. 1038; Most. 839, ut te absolvam, nullam conspicio; H. T. 457, ut alia omittam, absumpsit; Eun. 926; Phor. 654, ut aperte fabuler; Hec. 135, ut ad pauca redeam, uxorem deducit. With *ne*: Cas. 38, morbo cubat, nequid mentiar; Cist. 558, nutrix est, ne matrem censeas; Curc. 724, te perire cupio, ne nescias; Men. 23; 47, ne erretis, praedico; Most. 1005.

3. Purpose clauses introduced by *ut ne* (24): Amph. 489, uno labore absolvat ut ne in suspicione ponatur; Aul. 648, vah scelestus, quam benigne, ut ne intellegam; Merc. 960, expurigationem habebō ut ne suscenseat; And. 259, aliquid facerem ut ne hoc facerem; Enn. Trag. 351, quos ego dimitto ut ne res temere tractent; Cato, Agr. 33, 1, vitem deligato recte flexuosa uti ne sit; Amph. 126; Capt. 267; Cas. 513; Cist. 41; Merc. 992; M. G. 164; Pers. 603; Truc. 62; H. T. 269; Eun. 439; 945; Phor. 168; 245; 314; Ad. 354. In the following we have the perfect tense, used as a true present perfect: M. G. 199, quid agam, id ut ne visum siet? 227, cedo consilium ut visa ne sint; Eun. 942 ulciscar ut ne inipune in nos inluseris.

4. Relative clauses of purpose (435).

These are classified according to the particles by which they are introduced:

a) Introduced by relative pronouns (the commonest form), e.g. Amph. 183, aliquem hominem allegent qui mihi os occillet; 377, ut esset quem tu caederes; Asin. 188, si habeas quod des; Eun. 1078, habet quod det; Hec. 298, nova res ortast quae me abstrahat; Enn. Trag. 169, date ferrum qui me anima privem; Pacuv. 61, habeo ego qui distinguam; Rud. 767, ignem faciam :: quin inhumanum exuras tibi?

b) Introduced by *ubi* (42), Capt. 12, si non ubi sedeas locus est; 837, nescioquem nactus es ubi cenes; Curc. 311, datin sellam ubi assidat? 387, reliqui locum ubi reconderem; Phor. 596, tempus sibi dari ubi ostenderet; Cato, Agr. 11, 1, dolia ubi vinaceos condant; 14, 2; 129, aream ubi frumentum teratur.

c) Introduced by *unde* (29), M. G. 687, *eme lanam unde pallium conficiatur*; Pers. 493, *quaedam res unde lucrum facias*; Poen. 185, *neque id unde efficiat habet*; Trin. 158, *habeo dotem unde dem*; Ad. 122, *est unde haec fiant*.

d) Introduced by *quo* (21), Capt. 103, *nil est quo me recipiam*; Men. 669, *quasi non habeam quo intromittar alium locum*; And. 606, *utinam mi esset aliquid quo me darem*; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, *cor-tinam quo olea fluat*.

e) Introduced by *qua* (6), M. G. 142, *perfodi parietem qua com-meatus esset*; Cato, Agr. 112, 1, *relinquito locum qua interspiret*; so 112, 3; 113, 1.

Besides the formal classification, we may also divide relative purpose clauses into:

- a) Those in which the clause as a whole is adverbial.
- b) Those in which the clause is adjectival.

Examples of a) are Amph. 950, *gubernatorem arcessat qui nobis-cum prandeat*; Bacch. 1181, *i intro ubi tibi sit lepide*; M. G. 142, cited above.

Examples of b) are given in abundance above.

Adverbial relative purpose clauses are relatively rare, though chronologically they probably antedate adjectival purpose clauses. An example illustrating the ease of transition from the adverbial to the adjective value is M. G. 687, *eme lanam unde pallium conficiatur*, which may be taken either as 'buy wool in order that a cloak may be made,' or 'wool to make a cloak from.' These adjective purpose clauses are all descriptive. See below, p. 287.

Other views have been proposed in explanation of some, at least, of the above examples. Thus in sentences like Poen. 537, *est domi quod edimus*; Capt. 12, *est ubi ambules*; 121, *non est quod dem*; 12, *non ubi sedeas locus est*; Poen. 833, *habet quod det*; Most. 344, *da illi quod bibat*, Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gramm. 517, 2; cf. also Frank, Classical Philology, ii, p. 168) takes the dependent clause as potential. But Frank, *ibid.* 163 ff., well shows the baselessness of this view. He himself follows the traditional interpretation, which regards these clauses as relative clauses of purpose, though admitting that secondarily they have acquired a 'can' potential connotation. I do not find myself able to go even that far. To my mind,

homines misit qui nuntiarent; mihi aquam dedit quam biberem; mihi da quod bibam; non est quod dem; quod edit non habet; locus est ubi ambules, etc., are all varied types of one and the same kind of subordinate clause, viz. the relative clause of purpose. To read the 'can' notion into any of the expressions of this type occurring in Early Latin is in my judgment a gratuitous alteration of their obvious meaning. Certainly until it is shown that *det* and *haec fiant* can mean respectively, 'he can give,' and 'these things can be done,' I see no justification in claiming a 'can' potential origin and value for the dependent clause in *ut habeat quod det* and *est unde fiant*, etc.

Equally gratuitous to me seems the theory of Elmer, who explains these clauses as volitive descriptive clauses (see p. 294). See his note on Capt. 12, *si non ubi sedeas locus est*.

5. Relative purpose clauses with *dignus*, *indignus*, *idoneus*, etc. (25): Asin. 80, *me dignum habuit quod concederet*; 149; 314, *dignissumi quo cruciatus confluant*; Cist. 248; M. G. 1043, *deus dignior fuit quisquam qui esset?* Pseud. 611; Rud. 406; 522; And. 230; H. T. 741; Eun. 312, *est digna res ubi nervos intendas*; 1052; Hec. 212; Pacuv. 25; Gracch. (Meyer), p. 231; Stich. 205, *haud indignos iudico qui miseri sint*; Eun. 866; Hec. 477; Bacch. 616a, *indignior quod di bene faciant*; Aul. 252, *hominem idoneum quem ludos facias*; And. 493; 758; Afran. 198. Here belongs also Poen. 1335, *bellum hominem quem noveris*; so 1384.

With Madvig and Roby I regard relative clauses like those just cited as a special development of purpose clauses. To my mind there is no logical difference between *nemo est quem imiter*, 'there is no one for me to imitate,' and *nemo est dignus quem imiter*. The frequency of expressions (see 4, *a* above) like Curc. 386, *reliqui locum ubi reconderem*, where the relative clause of purpose has come to designate the end or adaptation of something, was calculated to bring about the use of relative clauses of purpose with adjectives of fitness, suitability, and adaptation. Cf. also the use of the gerund with *ad* after *dignus*, e.g. Cic. Rep. i, 18, 30, *dignus ad imitandum*. We also find the infinitive with *dignus* and *idoneus*.

Some (e.g. Greenough, Gramm. 535 f.) have regarded the relative clause with these adjectives as a clause of characteristic (descriptive clause of fact; see p. 289), i.e. as the kind of clause seen in *nemo est*

qui audeat: but the logical difference between clauses of this last kind and those under discussion must at once be obvious. Professor Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gramm. § 513, 3) designates the clauses under discussion as 'relative clauses of obligation or propriety' and considers them a manifestation of a somewhat extensive class of related uses, which he designates as the subjunctive of obligation and propriety. But the recognition of any such category of general independent fundamental uses lacks justification. Within certain narrow limits we do find subjunctives of obligation and propriety. Thus one development of the deliberative has this force (see p. 179 ff.) in interrogative sentences; and in non-interrogative sentences we find the imperfect and pluperfect so used, as the secondary development of the jussive and prohibitive (p. 176 f.). But outside of these limits I cannot see grounds for recognizing a subjunctive of obligation and propriety; and neither of these last two uses can have furnished a starting-point for the *dignus qui*-clauses.

6. Purpose clauses introduced by *quo = ut* (23). *Quo* in these is simply the relative pronoun used as an ablative of degree of difference. It is regularly, though not invariably, used with comparatives (see p. 257). Examples: Aul. 33, *quo facilius ducat*; Men. 9, *quo graecum videatur magis*; Poen. 39; 669; 905; 1109; H. T. 542; 914, *quo facilius dentur*; Eun. 150; Lucil. 894; Cato, Agr. 5, 6.

Quo minus and *quo setius* denote negative purpose, viz. And. 197, *si sensero hodie quicquam in his te nuptiis fallaciae conari quo fiant minus*; Afran. 292, *turbat me quo (tuā equo, *codd.*) setius me colligam*.

In the following 5 instances *quo* occurs even without a comparative: Amph. 834, *quo me impudicum faceret*; Rud. 1329, *quo nil invitus addas, talentum magnum (postulo)*; And. 472; H. T. 127; XII Tables in Cic. de Leg. ii, 23, *homini mortuo ne ossa legito quo post funus faciat*.

7. Purpose clauses introduced by *qui = ut* (7): Cist. 714, *qui facilius posset noscere*; Poen. 1264, *magis qui credatis*; Hee. 869, *qui facilius credas*; Aul. 596, *qui laborent minus*. In all these *qui* is combined with a comparative. In the following examples the comparative is lacking: Amph. 339, *hominem contra conloqui qui possum videri fortis*; Cato, Agr. 39, 2, *qui colorem eundem facias*; And. 5,

in prologis scribundis operam abutitur, non qui argumentum narret sed qui respondeat.

8. Substantive clauses of purpose (57). These are employed:

I. As appositives of various substantive ideas. Thus with

a) *Causa* (9): Eun. 512, causam ut manerem repperit; 138, fingit causas ne det; Acc. 292, eaque ivi causa ut ne quis nostra verba cleperet; Men. 892; Cato, Agr. 21, 4; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232; Hec. 105; Stich. 312; Aul. 464.

b) *Gratia* (5): And. 588, ea gratia ut pertemptarem; Trag. Incer. Ribb. p. 301; H. T. 769, ea gratia ne tu persentisceres; Aul. 32; Merc. 223.

c) *Hanc ob rem; ob eam rem; etc.* (8): Trin. 652, ob eam rem, ut tibi sit; Pseud. 795; Cas. 1005 (propter eam rem); Epid. 276 (quam ad rem); Truc. 395 (quoi rei); M. G. 1420; Rud. 717; Hec. 6.

d) *Eo*, M. G. 1080, eo minus dixi, ne censeret.

e) *Id, illud, hoc* (5): Amph. 909, id huc revorti ut me purgarem; Cas. 680; 532; Stich. 589; And. 162.

f) *Idcirco, propterea* (4): Pseud. 564, idcirco quo vos oblectem; Bacch. 730; 812; Hec. 106.

Hoc modo: Cato, Agr. 32, 1, arbores hoc modo putentur, rami uti divaricentur, et ne relinquantur.

II. As object of verbs. Thus:

a) With *paro, apparo, adorno* (14): Aul. 827, ut eriperes apparabas; Pseud. 486, paritas ut auferas; Trin. 1188; Phor. 957; Eun. 240; H. T. 948; Trag. incert. Ribb. i, p. 301; 304; Enn. Trag. 321, paratum pestem ut participet parem (*paratum* is Bentley's necessary conjecture for *paratam* of the MSS); Hec. 68; Epid. 361, adornat ut maritus fias; Rud. 129; Eun. 582.

b) With *exspecto, maneo* (3): Stich. 58, manet ut moneatur; Hec. 280, exspecto ut redeat; Trin. 734. Durham, p. 107, takes these as substantive clauses developed from the optative, but it seems more natural to explain them as purpose clauses.

III. Introduced by *quo minus* after expressions of hindering (6): CIL, i, 199, 34, neve prohibeto quo minus sumant; 33, quo minus pascere liceat ni quis prohibeto; 26, quod mora non fiat quo setius eam pecuniam acipiant; Cato, Agr. 148, 1; Amph. 84, quive alter quo placeret fecisset minus; CIL, i, 198, 71, neve facito quo quis

eorum minus ad id iudicium adesse possit; And. 699, per me stetisse quo minus fierent nuptiae. In these last three the notion of hindering is suggested by the context.

That these *quo minus*-clauses are substantive clauses of purpose seems sufficiently indicated by the fact that elsewhere *quo*, when joined with a comparative and followed by the subjunctive, is a purpose particle. See above, p. 261. We even find *quo minus* introducing an adverbial purpose clause in And. 197, conari quo fiant minus.

9. Connecting negatives in purpose clauses (22).

a) Form *ne . . . neve (neu)*: Capt. 219, ne queant neu permanet; Epid. 165; Merc. 230; M. G. 6; Poen. 30; 605; Rud. 700; Eun. 278; Hec. 587; Pacuv. 228; Cato, Agr. 92; Truc. 59; 97.

b) Form *ut . . . neve (neu)*: Bacch. 648; Trin. 1143, ut filius crederet neu posset; Hec. 545.

c) Form *ut . . . et ne*, Cato, Agr. 32, 2, ut caedantur et ne relinquantur; 107, ut odorata sint et ne quid accedat.

d) Form *ut . . . atque ut ne*, Amph. 126, ut possem atque ut ne quaererent.

e) Miscellaneous (4), Eun. 965, ne neque prosis et pereas; Ad. 624, ne dicerem ac fieret palam; Eun. 93, ut aut doleret aut istuc nil penderem; Capt. 434, ne me ignores tuque te pro libero esse ducas, neque des operam.

In no instance is *neque* used as a connecting negative. In Eun. 965 and Capt. 437, *neque* goes closely with the verb, which in each case is governed by a preceding *ne*.

THE STIPULATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

"Stipulative Subjunctive" is the name I have given to an idiom discussed at length in Transactions of the American Philological Association, xxxi, p. 223 ff. The Stipulative I defined as "a subordinate subjunctive clause designating primarily some agreement, compact, or understanding under which the main act takes place." The idiom, as I undertook to show, is sharply differentiated both logically and formally from clauses of proviso and also from conditional clauses, with both of which at times it seems to have relationship.

The origin of the stipulative, I found in paratactic uses of the jussive and prohibitive. Thus in *Curc.* 660, *tu ut hodie cenam des sororiam, hic nuptialem cras dabit*, the idea is 'do you give a dinner to-day; (then) he will give one to-morrow; i.e. 'he will give one to-morrow, on the understanding or condition, that you give one to-day.' So in *Trin.* 518, *arcano tibi ego hoc dico, ne ille ex te sciat*, the original notion was 'I tell you this in confidence; let him not learn it from you!' i.e. 'on the understanding that he is not to learn it from you.'

While more commonly the stipulative clause has the simple force of 'on the understanding that, that not'; 'with the agreement that, that not,' yet, as a perfectly natural outgrowth of this original value, we find it developing, under the influence of the context, a variety of other values. Thus it may mean 'under the restriction that, that not'; 'with the reservation that, that not'; 'on pain of'; 'on condition that, that not.' In the affirmative form it may also have the force of 'by' with a verbal noun; while with negatives (regularly *ne* or *ut ne*) it frequently has the force of 'without' followed by a verbal noun ('without doing,' 'without saying,' etc.).

The material is distributed according to the foregoing logical categories, so far as they appear in Early Latin.

1. Stipulative clauses with the force of 'on the understanding that, that not'; 'under the agreement that, that not.'

a) Affirmative (20), *Asin.* 752; 915, *postea demum huc cras adducam ad lenam, ut xx minas ei det, in partem hac amanti ut liceat ei potirier*; *Bacch.* 875; 1184, *quid tandem si dimidium auri redditur, in' mecum intro? atque ut eis delicta ignoscas*; *Capt.* 948; *Epid.* 470, *atque ita profecto, ut eam ex hoc exoneret agro*; *Men.* 53; *M. G.* 979, *vin tu illam actutum amovere, a te ut abeat per gratiam*; 1148; *Pers.* 523, *eam te volo curare ut istic veneat, ac suo periculo is emat qui mercabitur*; 662; *Pseud.* 57; *Rud.* 929; 1409; *Stich.* 195, *auctionem praedicem, ipse ut venditem*; *And.* 148, *ita discedo ut qui neget*; *Phor.* 633, *quid vis dari ut desistat, haec facessat?* *Cato, Agr.* 15, *uti dominus omnia ad opus praebeat . . . et uti sublinat locari oportet*; *C. Gracchus* (Meyer), p. 233, *ego ut tacerem, decem talenta a rege accepi!*

b) Negative (16).

1) With *ne, ut ne* (10): Asin. 229, quid me aequom censes dare, annum hunc ne cum quiquam alio sit; 635; Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt, atque ita ne mihi sit mora; 873, vis tibi ducentos nummos iam promittier, ut ne clamorem hic facias neu convicium; Poen. 888, nisi ero meo uni indicasso, atque ei quoque ut ne enuntiet; Trin. 141, quod meae concreditumst taciturnitati, ne enuntia rem neu facerem palam; 518; H. T. 783, ita istaec misceto ne me admisceas; Phor. 633, quid vis dari, tu molestus ne sies?

2) With *ni* (= *ne*) (5); see Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., xxxi, p. 239 ff. Epid. 699, da pignus ni ea sit filia. The MSS read *sit*, and so Goetz in his first edition, Leo, and Lindsay. Poen. 1242, da pignus ni nunc perieres; Rud. 1380, cedo quicum habeam iudicem, ni dolo malo instipulatus sis nive etiamdum siem xxv annos natus; Truc. 275, pignus da, ni lignae hae sint (sunt *P*) quas habes Victorias; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 62, 6, nunc si sponsonem fecissent cum Turio ni vir melior esset. On Pseud. 1070, roga me xx minas, si illa sit potitus, where I have suggested *ni* for *si*, see op. cit. p. 243 f.

3) With *nec*, Asin. 752, lenae dedit xx minas, ut secum esset . . . nec cum quiquam alio. The commoner connective with all clauses of volitive origin is *neve* (*neu*), *nive*, and these occur in Bacch. 873; Trin. 141; Rud. 1380 (see above). But exceptions to this principle have already been noted, not only in independent but also in dependent sentences of volitive origin; see p. 170; 243.

2. Stipulative clauses with the force of 'on pain of,' 'under penalty of' (4): Men. 216, ego hercle vero te et servabo et te sequar, neque hodie, ut te perdam meream deorum divitias mihi; originally 'on the understanding that I'm to lose you'; i.e. 'on pain of losing'; Stich. 24, neque ille sibi mereat Persarum montis, qui esse aurei perhibentur, ut istuc faciat; Bacch. 1183a, quem quidem ut non exerceam, alterum tantum auri non meream; Pers. 786, quem pol ego ut non in cruciatum atque in compedis cogam. . . . In these last two, we have irregularly *non* for *ne* or *ut ne* (cf. *nec* for *neu* in Asin. 752). In the last example the apodosis is omitted.

3. Stipulative clauses with the force of 'on condition that' (5): Aul. 458, lege agito mecum, molestus ne sis, 'go to law ('on the understanding that,' and so) on condition that you only let me alone';

Cure. 660, tu ut hodie cenam des sororiam, hic nuptialem cras dabit: promittimus; Asin. 455, sic potius, ut Demaeneto tibi ero praesente reddam; Poen. 1364, cras auctionem faciam.: tantisper quidem ut sis apud me lignea in custodia; Rud. 1127, concedam tibi, ac si istorum nil sit, ut mihi reddas.

4. Stipulative clauses with the force of 'by' with a verbal noun (8): Capt. 423, nunc adest occasio benefacta cumulare, ut erga hunc rem geras fideliter; M. G. 186, quem ad modum?: ut eum qui se hic vidit verbis vincat ne viderit; Pers. 35; Stich. 121, qui potest mulier vitare vitiis?: ut pridie caveat ne faciat quod pigeat; originally 'on the understanding that she avoid,' and so 'by avoiding.' True. 919; Bacch. 477; Pseud. 236, quonam pacto possim vincere animum?: in rem quod sit praevertaris. In this last the usual *ut* is absent. Hence it is not impossible that we have an independent use of the jussive.

5. Negative stipulative clauses with the force of 'without' with a verbal noun (18): Amph. 388, obsecro ut per pacem te alloqui, ut ne vapulem, 'on the understanding that I'm not to be beaten,' and so, 'without being beaten'; Asin. 319, habeo familiarem tergum, ne quaeram foris; so Aul. 358; M. G. 638; Asin. 718, licet laudem Fortunam ut ne Salutem culpem; Bacch. 343; Capt. 331, eum si reddis mihi, praeterea unum nummum ne duis ('without paying me a didrachm besides); cf. Vid. 83, argenti minam adferam ad te, faenus mihi nullum duis; Merc. 145, dic mihi an boni quid usquamst, quod quisquam uti possiet, sine malo omni aut ne laborem capias; M. G. 1207, nam si possem ullo modo impetrare ut abiret ne te abduceret. *Ne* is the reading of the MSS, retained by Leo and Lindsay; *nec*, conjectured by Salmasius, is read by Götz-Schöll and others. Poen. 177; 662, hic clam furtim esse volt, nequis sciat neue arbiter sit; Pseud. 322; Trin. 663; Eun. 217, censen posse me offirmare perpeti ne redeam.

The following examples have *ni* for *ne*: Cist. 204, hanc ego de me coniecturam facio, ni foris quaeram; Merc. 693, parumne est malai rei quod amat Demipho, ni sumptuosus siet; Most. 414, ut proveniant sine malo, ni quid potiatur quam ob rem pigeat vivere. Here, as in Merc. 145, it is noteworthy that we have a stipulative coördinate with a *sine*-phrase.

6. Substantive stipulative clauses (28).¹ Nearly all of the classes of stipulative clauses above recognized pass readily into substantive clauses. Such substantive clauses occur with considerable frequency in connection with verbs of bargaining, contracting, and the like; also in apposition with nouns like *condicio*, *leges*, *foedus*, etc.²

Examples:

a) After verbs:

convenit: Capt. 378, *nunc ita convenit inter me atque hunc*, Tyndare, *ut te in Alidem mittam; si non rebitas, huic ut xx minas dem*; 397; Amph. 226; Aul. 258; Naev. Bell. Pun. 47, *convenit regnum ut haberent*, Truc. Arg. 10.

coniuro: Merc. 536, *inter nos coniuravimus, neuter stupri caussa caput limaret*.

conduco: Epid. 314, *conducere aliquam fidicinam cantaret sibi*. The text is uncertain; Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. xxxi, p. 235. Epid. 500, *conducta veni ut cantarem*; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 58, 6, *conduci uti taceat*.

depeciscor: Phor. 165, *ut mi liceat frui, depecisci morte cupio*.

pacisco: Naev. Bell. Pun. 48, *id quoque paciscunt, moenia sint (tuta ?)*; *paciscit obsides ut reddat*.

b) After nouns:

condicio: Bacch. 1041, *duae condiciones sunt, vel ut aurum perdas vel ut amator perierit*; Rud. 1030.

lex: Asin. 234, *in leges meas dabo . . . perpetuom annum hunc mihi uti serviat nec quemquam alium admittat*; Most. 360; Pers. 69; Asin. 735; Aul. 155; And. 200; Phor. 533.

rabo: Truc. 688, *rabonem habeto ut mecum hanc noctem sies*.

signum: Bacch. 329, *id signumst cum Theotimo, ei aurum ut reddat*.

pacto, modo ('terms'): Bacch. 1178, *scin quo pacto me abducas ? : : mecum ut sis*; Poen. 853, *quo modo ? : : ut corium sufferas*; Amph. 1023; Truc. 918.

The following also seem to belong here: Aul. 434, *haud paenitet tua ne expetam*; Cure. 663, *quid dotis ? : : egone ? : : ut semper me alat*; Men. 966, *spectamen bono servo id est, ut rem eri tutetur*.

¹ See Durham, Substantive Clauses, p. 64 ff.

² These substantive stipulative clauses are of course very closely related to the substantive clauses considered above on p. 236 f.

CLAUSES OF PROVISIO.¹

Clauses of Proviso seem to be a development of the jussive and prohibitive subjunctive. Thus in *manent ingenia senibus, modo permaneat studium et industria*, the original sense was: 'Let only interest and vigor remain! (then) old men's faculties remain.' Cf. the paratactic use of the imperative, e.g. *Asin. 240, modo argentum adferito; facile patiar cetera. Dum*, the commonest particle in these clauses, was probably originally an oblique case of a noun meaning 'while.' Hence in *oderint, dum metuant*, the original sense was: 'Let them fear the while! (then) they may hate.' Some scholars, e.g. Methner, in *Glotta*, i, p. 251, regard the clause of proviso introduced by *dum* as of temporal origin (*dum* meaning, 'as long as'), but this view fails to account for the negative *ne* employed in these clauses. What Methner says on p. 252 in attempting to explain the negative can hardly be regarded as of weight.

1. With *dum* (33): *Bacch. 418, dum caveatur, sine; Capt. 607, volo, dum istic vinciatur; 694, dum pereas, nihil interdico aiant vivere; Cas. 75, mecum pignus dato, Poenus dum iudex siet; 331; Curc. 35, dum ted apstineas nupta, ama quidlubet; 180; 428; 460; 704; Epid. 348, dum tibi placeam atque opsequar, meum tergum flocci facio; 679; Men. 90, dum tu quod edit praebeas, numquam fugiet; Merc. 906, dum istic siet; Most. 71, dum interea sic sit, istuc 'actutum' sino; Pers. 145, me etiam vende, dum saturum vendas; 387; Rud. 746, quid mea refert, dum mihi recte serviant; 1100; Stich. 553, quattuor sane dato dum equidem quod edint addas; 686, convenit, dum quidem veniat cum vino suo; Trin. 58, dum quidem hercle tecum nupta sit, sane velim; 211; Truc. 736, discant, dum mihi commentari liceat; And. 677, capitis periculum adire, dum prosim tibi; Eun. 741, ferre possum, verba dum sint; Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae, dum huic obsequare; Pacuv. 288, illis opitularier quovis exitio cupio, dum prosim; Acc. 204, oderint dum metuant; Trag. Incert. Ribb. 159, pereant amici, dum inimici una intercendant; Lucil. 536, coquos non curat caudam insignem esse,*

¹ Elste, *De dum particulae usu Plautino*, 1882; Boettger, *De dum particulae usu apud Terentium et in reliquiis trag. et com.*, 1887; Richardson, *De dum particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, 1886; Schmalz, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, xi, p. 333 ff.

illas dum pinguis siet. In Asin. 166, habeto hac lege, dum superes datis, the proviso clause is substantive, in apposition with *lege*.

2. With *dum ne*, *dum ni* (21): Aul. 211, dum quidem ne quid perconteris; 491, quo lubeant nubant, dum dos ne fiat comes; Bacch. 866, pacisce quid tibi lubet, dum ne hominem opprimat nive enicet; Capt. 338, quidvis, dum ab re ne quid ores, faciam; 682; Cure. 36, dum ne per fundum saeptum facias semitam, ama quidlubet; Merc. 423, me illam posse opinor vendere. :: dum quidem hercle ne minoris vendas quam ego emi; M. G. 893, dum ne scientes quod bonum faciamus, ne formida; Pers. 657, dum quidem ne nimis diu tua sim, volo; Trin. 979, dum ille ne sis quem ego esse nolo, sis mea caussa qui lubet; And. 902, quidvis cupio, dum ne me falli comperiar; Hec. 634, dum ne reducam, turbent quam velint; Cato, Agr. 5, 4, opus omne curet, dum ne lassus fiat; 33, 1; 50, 2; CIL, i, 196, dum ne minus c senatoribus adesent (ter); 198, 16, dum nequem legat; 198, 30, quod recte factum esse volet, dum nequid advorsus hanc legem fiat; 198, 63; 199, 31, dum ne intromitat; 41, id uti facere liceat, dum ne ampliorem modum habeant; 202, II, 12, ea lege praecones legunto, dum niquem in eius locum praeconem legant; i, 577, III, 10, dum ni minus xx adsient.

3. With *dum modo* (11): Amph. 644, absit, dum modo laude parta domum recipiat se; 996; Aul. 239, dum modo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis; Epid. 270, facere cupio quidvis, dum id fiat modo; M. G. 253, quantumvis prolationis, dum modo hunc inducamus; 784; H. T. 466, sumat, dum modo habeam; 641; Eun. 320, nil refert, dum potiar modo; Naev. Com. 130, dum (modo) videat; Afran. 408, dum modo doleat aliquid, doleat quid lubet.

4. With *modo*: Eun. 890, volet, civis modo haec sit.

5. With *ut modo*, *modo ut*: Asin. 274, aetatem velim servire, Libanum ut conveniam modo; Phor. 58, scies, modo ut tacere possis.

Methner, op. cit. p. 246, makes the assertion that the main clause on which provisos introduced by *dum* depend. contains "keine Behauptung, sondern eine Willenserklärung." But he overlooks important material for Early Latin. I have noted the following examples in which the main clause does not express a "Willenserklärung." Barring Amph. 996, which, in my opinion, Methner misinterprets, none of these passages are recognized in his paper:

Curc. 460, quid id refert, dum argentum accipias? Merc. 906, quid refert, dum siet; Pers. 387, dum dos sit, nullum vitium vitio vortitur; Rud. 746, quid mea refert, dum mihi recte serviant? Stich. 687, convenit, dum veniat; Trin. 211, non flocci faciunt, dum illud quod lubeant sciant; Eun. 742, ferre possum, verba dum sint; Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae, dum huic obsequare; Lucil. 536; Aul. 239, dum modo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis; M. G. 784; H. T. 641, quidvis satis est, dum vivat modo; Eun. 320; Amph. 996, quod omnis homines facere oportet, dum modo fiat bono, is cited by M., but I can see no "Willenserklärung" in *facere oportet*.

Dum-Clauses Denoting a Wish.

Different from the *dum*-clauses just discussed, are, in my judgment, the five following examples. These seem to go back rather to an optative origin, embodying, as they do, a wish existing in the mind of the subject of the leading verb. Asin. 428, operam dedo, dum reperiam, 'in my desire to find': Capt. 32, nil pretio parsit dum filio parceret, 'in his desire to save his son'; Merc. 84, dico amorem missum facere me, dum illi obsequar; Pseud. 1282, inde huc exii crapulam dum amoverem; And. 825, dum id efficias quod cupis, neque modum benignitatis neque quid ores, cogitas.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUAMVIS* *QUANTUMVIS*, *UT*, 'ALTHOUGH.'

Material falling under this head is extremely rare in Early Latin. I have noted only the following examples: Bacch. 82, locus hic apud nos, quamvis subito venias, semper liber est; Trin. 554, quamvis malam rem quaeras, reperias; Cato, Agr. 1, 6, quamvis quaestuosus siet; Truc. 571, des quantumvis, nusquam apparet; Hec. 296, ut taceam, quoivis facile scitu est.

These apparently have developed from a jussive parataxis, — 'come as suddenly as you will,' etc. Possibly they are still at the paratactic stage.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.¹

The subjunctive in the apodosis of conditional sentences is potential in character and has already been considered in detail above, pp. 197; 201. The present chapter, therefore, will deal only with the employment of the subjunctive in protases.

Origin. The origin of the subjunctive in the protasis of Latin conditional sentences is not altogether clear. Very likely, too, the different types of conditional sentences are not all of the same origin, but are to be referred, some to one source, others to another. Thus, Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* ii, p. 401, refers sentences of the type *si habere, dare* to an Indo-European optative² for their origin. He is led to this in view of the fact that Sanskrit employs the optative in unreal conditions, while the usage is likewise not unknown to Greek; e.g. Ψ 274, εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ ἀεθλεύοιμεν Ἀχαιοί, ἦ τ' ἂν ἐγὼ τὰ πρῶτα λαβὼν κλισίῃνδε φερόιμην. In the case of conditions of the type *si habeam, dem*, we may very likely, according to Delbrück, have a fusion of subjunctive and optative. Essentially the same are the views of Schmalz (*Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 583) and of Hale (*Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin*, *Harvard Studies*, xii, p. 109 ff.), except that Hale in addition to the volitive, optative, and potential recognizes also an "anticipatory" subjunctive as participating in the origin of the Latin subjunctive in protases. Nutting, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xxiv, p. 149 ff., dissents from the views of the scholars just cited, particularly so far as the participation of the volitive and true optative is involved in the origin of subjunctive protases in Latin. He would refer the use of the subjunctive in Latin protases (just as the use of optative and subjunctive protases in Greek) to "the vague and shifting meaning

¹ Rothheimer, *De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis*, 1876; Liebig, *Die hypothetischen Sätze bei Terenz*, 1863; Blase, *De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis conditionalibus permutatione*, *Diss. Phil. Argent.* x, p. 94 ff.; *Geschichte des Irrealis im Lateinischen*, 1888; Lindskog, *De enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium conditionalibus*, 1895; Hale, *Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin*, *Harvard Studies*, xii, p. 109 ff.; Nutting, *The Order of Conditional Thought*, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xxiv, p. 149 ff.; O. Brugmann, *Gebrauch des Konditionalen NI in der älteren Latinität*, 1887; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 400 ff.; Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 580 ff.

² Delbrück, apparently, does not refer such sentences either to the wish use or the potential use exclusively, but to both; see p. 403.

attached to early mood-forms," a virtual renunciation of any explanation of origin.

Semasiologically the difficulties in the way of a volitive and optative origin for subjunctive protases will impress most as imaginary. At all periods of the language, though never frequently, we find paratactic subjunctives used with conditional force, *e.g.* Cic. Verr. 2, 10, 26, *veniat nunc, experiatur: tecto recipiet nemo*; N. D. i, 57, *roges me: nihil respondeam*. These two examples both illustrate how a volitive expression might easily develop into a protasis, and they lend plausibility to the theory that a conditional period like *si videat, credat*, for example, may go back to an original *videat: credat*, 'let him see; he would then believe'; *i.e.* 'if he should see, he would believe.' In support of this explanation may be cited also the use of the imperative with the force of a protasis, *e.g.* *cras petito, accipiet*.

Si seems originally to have been an adverb meaning 'so.' The most primitive form of conditional sentence with *si* would be seen in an expression like *bene est si: valet*, 'it is well so: (viz. that) he is well.' Here *si* limits *bene est*, and *valet* is really an appositive of the adverbial idea in *si*. Out of this use, quite probably, has developed the conjunction *si*. Cf. English *so* in such expressions as 'so you pay me, I shall be satisfied'; originally, 'I shall be satisfied so, viz. you pay me.' Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 581, influenced by such expressions as Lucil. 501, *si secubitet, sic quoque non impetret*, explains the use of *si* as arising from an original correlation, *si . . . sic*. In support of this he cites the German 'so du heute mit mir speisest, so darfst du glauben.'

To an optative origin might well be referred a sentence of the type, *si haberem, darem*, originally, 'would that I had; I would give'; *i.e.* 'if I had, I would give.'

On the whole I am in accord with the views of Delbrück and Schmalz, though it seems to me more likely that the potential uses have not contributed to the origin of the subjunctive protasis in Latin, but that the volitive and optative uses are solely responsible for the use.

Classification of Subjunctive Protases.

The various formal types of conditional sentences in Early Latin are extremely numerous. They are made the basis of the following classification, while the various logical or functional types, which are few, are made subordinate to the formal categories.

I. PROTASIS IN THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. Apodosis in the present subjunctive (potential) (172). Type *si sit . . . sit*.

a) The time of the protasis is future and it is implied that the content of the protasis is capable of realization (117).

1) Introduced by *si* (104): Amph. 871, mea sit culpa, si id Alcu-
menae expetat; Asin. 458, si sciat, suscenseat; 895, nauteam bibere
malim, si necessum sit; Cas. 573, si neget, amittat; Cure. 211; Poen.
322; Trin. 457; And. 376; H. T. 556; Eun. 355; Pacuv. 130; Stat.
127; Lucil. 40.

2) Introduced by *nisi* (4): Acc. 102, nisi quid tulat, peream;
Truc. 564; Men. 454; Stich. 296.

3) Introduced by *nisi si*: Trin. 474, nisi si votet. *Si* is here
redundant.

4) Introduced by *ni*: Titin. 26, ni nos texamus, nil siet.

5) Introduced by *si non* (3): Cist. 45, si non nubat, familia
pereat. Here *non* negatives nubat; *nisi* would fail to convey the
requisite meaning. In Afran. 31, and Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 58, 1, the
context does not show whether *nisi* might have been employed in
case of the *si non* actually used.

6) Introduced by relatives (3): Aul. 230, ubi onus nequeam
ferre, iaceam in luto; Pseud. 318; Hec. 742.

b) The time of the protasis is the present, and it is implied that
the content of the protasis is contrary to fact (51). It is not always
easy to determine whether a given protasis belongs under a) or b).
A number of passages bear either interpretation. I have endeavored
to exercise conservatism in admitting examples to category b).

1) Introduced by *si* (43): Asin. 188, si nunc habeas quod des,
alia verba praehibeas; 393, si sit domi, dicam tibi; Bacch. 46, si
habeat aurum, faciat; 635, si mihi sit, non pollicear? Capt. 238,

si audeam, nominem; Cist. 116, si possim, velim; Epid. 331, si habeam, pollicear; Men. 504, non negem, si noverim; 640, haud rogem, si sciam; M. G. 1256, sentiat, si intus sit; 1371; 1429; Most. 895; Pers. 44; And. 276; 310; 652; 914; Phor. 171; Enn. Trag. 271; Pacuv. 407.

2) Introduced by *nisi* (3): Bacch. 636, nisi ames, non habeam; Stich. 190; 508.

3) Introduced by *ni* (5): Men. 110, ni stulta sies, tibi odio habeas; M. G. 1284; Poen. 877; Rud. 1418; And. 551.

An examination of the foregoing material cited under *a*) and *b*) shows that in Early Latin a protasis in the present subjunctive may indicate either something whose future realization is suggested as possible or something which is clearly implied to be contrary to fact.¹ Only the context can determine what type we have in any special case, and, as already intimated, even the context is not always sufficient to settle the question, as several examples admit of either interpretation. See Rothheimer, *De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis*, p. 36; Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, p. 13 ff.

c) The action of the protasis is achronistic and the subject is the indefinite 2d singular (see p. 319, below) (3): Amph. 705, si obsequare, una resolvas plaga; Cist. 33, si adeas, abitum malis; 96, si ames, consulas.

2. Apodosis in the present indicative (103). Type, *si sit . . . est*.²

a) Introduced by *si* (75): Asin. 164, si ductem, referre gratiam numquam potes; 318, si conferant, habeo; Aul. 558, interbibere, si vino scatat, Pirenem potest; Asin. 933, si aliud nil sit, pudet; Aul. 254, neque si cupiam, copias; Bacch. 128, si habeas, addeceat; 1003, non laturus sum, si iubeas; Capt. 850, scis bene esse, si sit unde; 906, si memorem, morast; Curc. 299, recte monstrat, si imperare possit; Merc. 298, si scias, plus video; 430, si velim, dantur; M. G.

¹ So also in Sanskrit and occasionally in Greek; see below, p. 278.

² Langen, *Beiträge zum Plautus*, 1881, p. 43 ff.; Lilie, *Conjunctivischer Bedingungssatz bei indikativischem Hauptsatz im Lateinischen*, 1884; Blase, *Der Konjunktiv des Präsens im Bedingungssatz*, *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, ix, p. 17 ff.; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1904, p. 15 ff.; *De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis conditionalibus permutatione*, p. 5 ff.; Lodge, *On the Theory of the Ideal Condition in Latin*, *Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*, p. 253 ff.; Nutting, *Classical Review*, xvii, p. 449 ff.; *University of California Publications, Classical Philology*, i, p. 35 ff.

685, bona uxor suave est, si sit usquam gentium ubi inveniri possit; 1263; H. T. 632, si neges, scio; Phor. 738, si possim, nihil est; Hec. 266; Ad. 202. Of the 75 subjunctive protases falling under this head, 18 are of the indefinite 2d singular (see below, p. 320): Bacch. 440, si attingas, puer dirumpit caput; Capt. 202, animo si bono utare, adiuvat; Cas. 721; Epid. 674; Men. 103, standum est in lecto, si petas; M. G. 673; Pers. 449; Poen. 635; 636; 812; Trin. 349; 1053; And. 637, si roges, nil pudet; Ad. 28; 29; 32; Trag. Incert. Ribb. p. 280, aperte fatur, si intellegas; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 83, 5; si exerceas conteritur.

b) Introduced by *nisi* (8): Ad. 943, non (omitto), nisi exorem; Truc. 234; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1. Three of these are in the indefinite 2d singular, Capt. 222, doli non doli sunt, nisi astu colas; Truc. 461; Acc. 215.

c) Introduced by *ni* (5): Hec. 473, possum, ni velim; Phor. 544; 547; And. 918, ni metuam patrem, habeo illum quod moneam; Pacuv. 277.

d) Introduced by *si non*: Rud. 159, si non moneas, meminimus; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 6, si non exerceas (indef. 2d sing.), tamen rubigo interfecit.

e) Introduced by *si nihil*: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 7, si nihil exerceas, inertia plus detrimenti facit (indef. 2d sing.).

f) Introduced by *si modo*: Pseud. 997, id ago, si modo taceas.

g) Introduced by *et si, tam etsi*: Truc. 815, etsi taceas, intellego; Eun. 216, memini, tam etsi nullus moneas.

h) Introduced by *sin*: And. 165, sin eveniat, restat.

i) Introduced by relatives (5): Bacch. 992, verum qui satis videat, satis grandes sunt; Curc. 590; Epid. 536; Pseud. 438; Cato, Agr. 16, 1.

Substantive *si*-clauses occur in Asin. 528, an te id exspectare oportet, si quis promittat; And. 568, incommoditas huc redit, si eveniat discessio.

In several of the above passages, the present subjunctive has contrary-to-fact force, e.g. M. G. 685; Hec. 471; And. 918.

3. The apodosis is in the future indicative (21). Type, *si sit . . . erit*.

a) Introduced by *si* (20): Asin. 414, si dicas, numquam effugies; 699, vehes me, si speres; Aul. 311, si roges, numquam dabit; Curc.

186; Merc. 650; Poen. 729; H. T. 594; fiet : : si sapias; Phor. 229; Stat. 113, audibis, si redeat; Cato, Agr. 6, 3; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232. There are two instances of the indefinite 2d singular: Amph. 703, si velis adversarier, insaniorem facies; Cato, 95, 2, si in tecto coquas, excandescet.

b) Introduced by *ni*: Bacch. 1171a, ni abeas, malum tibi dabo.

4. The apodosis consists of *quid* (30). Type: *quid, si sit?* Capt. 612, quid si adeam; so also Cist. 321; Curc. 145; 303; Epid. 543; Poen. 330; Amph. 313, quid, si tangam? Bacch. 732, quid, si scribat? Cas. 357; H. T. 719; Eun. 369.

5. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive (3). Type: *si sit, quid agam?* Asin. 506, ubi piem Pietatem, si postulem? Bacch. 79; Ad. 784 (with *nisi*).

6. The apodosis is a jussive or prohibitive subjunctive (9). Type: *si sit, abeas*. Asin. 120, si velis, mandes; Aul. 100, si Bona Fortuna veniat, ne intromiseris! Men. 502, si aequom facias, odiosus ne sies! Rud. 680a, si modo id liceat, vis ne opprimat! Ad. 372; Aul. 489, hoc qui dicat, . . . nubant, also belongs here, though it involves an anacoluthon. There is one instance of the indefinite 2d singular, Phor. 688, si quid velis, huic mandes!

7. The apodosis stands in the imperative (7). Type: *si sit, fac*. Asin. 445, si velis, commoda amico! Men. 52, si quis curari sibi velit, imperato! Hec. 493, si sanus sies, iube redire! Lucil. 177; Cato, Agr. 40, 4, obtegito, si pluat ('against the possibility of rain').

8. The apodosis stands in the perfect (potential) subjunctive (11). Type: *si sit, dixerim*. Amph. 510, illa si sciat, ego faxim; Bacch. 1055, qui dicat, haud cum illo ausim; Cas. 424, si me suspendam, operam luserim et fecerim et creaverim; Epid. 258, si aequom siet, dederim; M. G. 669; Poen. 886; Rud. 978; Hec. 424, aufugerim, si eo mihi redeundum sciam; Titin. 120; Pacuv. 12, 13.

9. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative: Curc. 226, si non ferat, non potuit retineri; Pseud. 433, si sint vera, quid mirum fecit?

10. The apodosis stands in the imperfect subjunctive. The condition is contrary to fact: Aul. 523, compellarem, ni metuam; Truc. 830, vinum si fabulari possit, se defenderet; Poen. 1251, si possit, (posset? A) id ego evenisset vellem.

11. There is no apodosis, but the present subjunctive with *si* or *si*

modo is equivalent to a wish (4): Capt. 996, modo si possit; Trin. 1187, si facias (Cam.; facies, *CD*; faciaes, *B*) modo; Eun. 647; also Poen. 550, omnia istaec scimus; si hi spectatores sciant, which calls for a strong mark of punctuation after *scimus*, not a comma, the usual punctuation.

12. A jussive subjunctive serves as protasis, e.g. H. T. 643, melius peius, prosit obsit, nil vident nisi quod lubet; see also p. 178.

13. Present and perfect are combined in the protasis in Trin. 83, si suspicer, si non feceris, atque mihi lubeat, qui potes?

14. The apodosis is involved in some word not a verb (4): Pseud. 87, vix, si me opponam; Trin. 27, invitus, ni me invitet fides; Phor. 170, beatus, ni unum desit; Eun. 50. In the last three examples the protasis is contrary to fact.

15. The apodosis is not expressed (17): Bacch. 698, immo si audias; Cas. 668, immo si scias; so also Curc. 321; Pseud. 749; H. T. 599; 764; 771; Cist. 734, sine dicat : : si dicat quidem; Cas. 743, cena modo si sit cocta; Merc. 724. In H. T. 658, nescio, nisi quaeras, the protasis depends not upon *nescio*, but upon something to be supplied in thought.

16. The protasis is modified by a second protasis (3): Merc. 826, faxim, si plectantur, si scortum duxerit, plures sint vidui; Poen. 864; Trin. 217.

II. PROTASIS IN THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. The apodosis stands in the present (potential) subjunctive (26). Type: *si fuerit, sit*.

Introduced by *si*: Asin. 878, possis, si conspexeris, cognoscere? 603; Aul. 344; 610; 749; Bacch. 311, sit carior, si circumduxerit; 1102, si plus perdiderim, minus aegre habeam; Men. 163; Merc. 518, possin tu, si usus venerit, subtemen nere? Most. 555, dicam, si confessus sit; Pers. 283; Poen. 147; Pseud. 339; 981; Rud. 476; Trin. 468; 538; 693; 950; Truc. 344; H. T. 1035; Eun. 387; 862; Hec. 609; Enn. Trag. 261; Lucil. 342.

2. Type: *quid si fecerit?* Capt. 599, quid si fecerit? Rud. 472.

3. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive: only Amph. 155, quid faciam, si me in carcerem compegerint?

4. The apodosis is in the present indicative: Amph. 741, tua istuc

refert, si curaveris. The two following have the indefinite 2d singular: Poen. 213, nullae res si forte occeperis, plus negoti habent; Trin. 1051, si quoi dederis, fit perditum.

5. The apodosis is in the future indicative: only Hec. 330, si factus siet, comminiscentur.

6. The apodosis is in the perfect subjunctive: H. T. 316, si quid te fugerit, ego perierim; Truc. 60.

7. The apodosis is a jussive or prohibitive subjunctive (7): Asin. 794, si tussire occepsit, ne sic tussiat; 806, si forte dixerit, reddat; 785; M. G. 1362; Trin. 347, bene si feceris, ne pigeat; 348, ut potius pudeat, si non feceris (the last two illustrate the indef. 2d sing.); Cato, Agr. 14, 3.

8. The main protasis is modified by a second protasis: Aul. 380, festo die si quid prodegeris, profesto egere liceat, nisi peperceris (indef. 2d sing.); Stich. 191, lumbos diffractos velim, ni perierit, si cenassit.

In two of the foregoing examples the perfect protasis is contrary to fact, and refers to the past; viz. Most. 555, dicam, si confessus sit; H. T. 1035, non, si ex capite sis meo natus, patiar. Other instances where the perfect subjunctive protasis refers to the past (though not contrary to fact) are: Poen. 213; Trin. 347; 348; 1051.

III. PROTASIS IN THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. The apodosis is also in the imperfect subjunctive (63). Type: *si esset, esset*.

Originally, apparently, the present subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis was employed in conditions contrary to fact. So in Sanskrit the present optative was used, and at least once in Homer (Ψ 274) we find the present optative in such a conditional sentence. Cf. Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik⁴, 584, "Ursprünglich hatten die Konjunktive der einzelnen Zeiten die ihren Indikativen entsprechende temporale Geltung. Daher bezog sich *si haberem, darem* nur auf die Vergangenheit . . . und *si dem, habeam* wurde auch für den Irrealis der Gegenwart gebraucht. Dies können wir für Plautus noch konstatieren." Cf. also Lindskog, De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis, p. 89.

It was owing to the ambiguity of *si dem, habeam*, therefore, that a new form for the present condition contrary-to-fact was called into existence, viz. the imperfect subjunctive, which previously had served to express *past* conditions contrary-to-fact. The place of the imperfect was now taken by the pluperfect. Examples of the imperfect in conditional sentences referring to the past¹ are: Aul. 742, *deos credo voluisse: nam ni vellent, non fieret*; Asin. 678, *numquam facerem, genua ni tam nequiter fricares*; Ad. 106, *si esset unde fieret, faceremus*; Acc. 614. Aul. 439, cited by Blase, *De modorum temporumque . . . permutatione*, p. 5, does not seem to me to refer to the past. In the five following examples the apodosis refers to the past, the protasis to the present: Amph. 525, *nisi te amarem plurimum, non facerem*; Bacch. 916; Cas. 556; Trin. 115, *si mi inimicus esset, haud crederet*; 957.

Other examples of the imperfect in both members of conditional sentences are:—

a) Introduced by *si* (43): Cas. 811, *si equos esses, esses indomabilis*; M. G. 1262, *videres, si amares*; Aul. 440; Pers. 45, *si id esset mihi, pollicerer*; Poen. 691; Pseud. 640, *si intus esset, provocarem*; 1236; Rud. 202; 553; Eun. 176, *si crederem, possem*; 446; Phor. 9; 207; Hec. 249; Pacuv. 391, *si adesset, commiseresceret*.

b) Introduced by *ni* (13): Asin. 860, *ni vera ista essent, numquam faceret ea*; Bacch. 554, *ni esset, orarem*; Pseud. 1320, *ni doleres, ego dolerem*; Phor. 269; 278; Hec. 7b.

c) Introduced by *nisi* (3): Amph. 525, *nisi amarem, non facerem*; Most. 844; And. 578.

d) Introduced by *qui*: Eun. 487, *nemo posset qui haberet*.

2. The apodosis is in the pluperfect subjunctive (15). Type: *si esset, fuisset*. Asin. 396, *si adesset, recepisset*; Men. 241, *invenissemus, si viveret*; 460; M. G. 1318; Pers. 173, *ovis si in ludum iret, potuisset*; H. T. 230; Ad. 525.

In the following instances² the protasis refers to the past: Asin. 396; Bacch. 486; Rud. 590, *si invitare nos paulisper pergeret, ibidem obdormissemus*; Stich. 742; Pers. 173.

¹ See Blase, *De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis condicionalibus Latinis permutatione*, p. 5 ff.

² Cf. Blase, *De modorum temporumque . . . permutatione*, p. 8.

3. The protasis consists of a jussive subjunctive (5). Type: *absque hoc esset, haberem*. Bacch. 412, *absque te esset, ego illum haberem*; Capt. 754, *absque hoc esset, usque me ductarent*; Men. 1022; Pers. 836; Trin. 832, *absque foret te, distraxissent me*; 1127; Phor. 188; Hec. 601, *quam fortunatus sum absque una hac foret*!

This usage seems to be modelled on the use of the present in protasis (p. 277).

4. The apodosis is in the perfect indicative (9): Bacch. 819, *hunc si ullus deus amaret, mortuom esse oportuit*; M. G. 803, *non potuit reperire, si ipsi Soli quaerendas dares, lepidiores*; Most. 443, *potuit exspectatior venire qui te nuntiaret mortuom*; 462, *quo modo potui, si non tangerem?* Pseud. 792; Pers. 594, *paene in foveam decidi, ni adesses*; Trin. 566, *licitumst, si velles*; Pseud. 285, *fuit occasio, si vellet, argentum ut daret*; H. T. 916, *quot res dedere ubi possem persentiscere, ni essem lapis*! In all these examples the imperfect is most naturally taken as referring to the past.

5. The apodosis is in the imperfect indicative: Bacch. 563, *non erat copia, nisi occiperes?* Lucil. 150, *si id satis esse potisset, hoc sat erat*.

6. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative: Stich. 512, *magis par fuerat, nisi nollem*; M. G. 53, *ni hebes machaera foret, uno ictu occideras*. In this last the imperfect refers to the past.

7. The apodosis is an optative subjunctive: only Aul. 645, *di me perdant, si abstuli nive adeo abstulisse vellem*.

8. The apodosis is an historical infinitive: only Trin. 837, *scindere vela, ni tua pax foret praesto*; where *foret* refers to the past.

9. Type: *quid si faceret?* only Phor. 645, *quid, si filiam locaret?*

10. The apodosis consists of an imperfect subjunctive followed by the pluperfect: only Ad. 770, *si meus esses : : dis esses, rem constabilisses*.

11. The main protasis is followed by a second: only Men. 239, *si acum quaereres, invenisses, si appareret*.

12. The apodosis is implied in the context: Phor. 302, *dixisti pulcre: si quidem quisquam crederet*.

IV. PROTASIS IN THE PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. The apodosis is in the imperfect subjunctive (41): Type: *si fuisset, esset*.

a) Introduced by *si* (28): Asin. 502, si esses percontatus, crederes; Aul. 828, quid faceres, si repperissem; Curc. 700, si voluisset, mitteret; Merc. 993, si scissem sive dixisset, numquam facerem; Capt. 871; M. G. 29; Trin. 568; And. 479; Phor. 119; 393: Ad. 178.

b) Introduced by *ni* (7): Bacch. 217, ni nactus essem, dicerem; 1209, neque haec faceremus, ni vidissemus; Cist. 625; Phor. 155; 369; 826; Hec. 220.

c) Introduced by *nisi*: only Bacch. 1207, nisi fuissent nihili, non flagitium facerent.

d) Introduced by *si non* (4): M. G. 1320, si non egisset, egeret; Pseud. 1324; Phor. 14. In the first and third of these examples we should normally have had *nisi* or *ni*.

e) Introduced by relatives: Trin. 178, qui emisset, eius essetne pecunia? Phor. 396, quom advenissem, dicerem.

In eight of the foregoing examples the imperfect refers to the past, viz. in Capt. 871; Bacch. 1207; Cist. 625; Curc. 700; Merc. 994; M. G. 29; Trin. 568. See Blase, De modorum temporumque permutatione, p. 9 f.; but Blase includes some other examples which are hardly cases in point.

One passage occurs in which we have a 'should'-'would' condition from a past point of view, M. G. 720, si ei forte fuisset febris, censerem emori: cecidissetve ebrius aut de equo uspiam, metuerem ne ibi diffregisset crura. There is nothing contrary to fact in this expression (notwithstanding the fact that it is preceded by a contrary-to-fact period in v. 719). We rather have an original *si fuerit*, *metuam*, etc., looked at from the past.

2. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect subjunctive (21). Type: *si fuisset, fuisset*.

a) Introduced by *si* (17): M. G. 718, si habuissem, cepissem; Trin. 927, si appellasses, respondisset; And. 604, si quiessem, nil evenisset; 808, si scissem, numquam huc tetulisset pedem; H. T. 157; Eun. 672; Phor. 20.

b) Introduced by other particles (4): Trin. 172, fecisset, ni praesensisset; Aul. 669; Hec. 289, si non (= nisi) rediisses, factae essent ampliores; Plaut. Frag. 117, nisi fugissem, praemorsisset.

3. The apodosis stands in the present subjunctive: only Stich. 510, vocem te, nisi dixisset.

4. The apodosis stands in the imperfect indicative: only Cist. 152, si tacuisset, eram dicturus.

5. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (4): Merc. 694, decem si vocasset, nimium obsonavit; Truc. 140; H. T. 164, si voluisses, oportuit; Cure. 449, si forent conclusi, non potuere.

6. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative: Phor. 536, si pote fuisset, promissum fuerat; And. 691, potuerat, si quiesset.

7. Type: *quid si fecisset?* And. 102, quid si amasset? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 60, 3.

8. The apodosis stands in the present indicative: only And. Alter Ex. 5, non nova istaec condiciost, si voluissem.

Conditional Sentences in which the Protasis has Adversative ('Concessive') Force.¹

In a considerable number of passages the protasis has the force of 'even if,' the relation usually designated as 'concessive' but which is more accurately designated as 'adversative.' The material (much of it already cited in our classification) is as follows:

a) Introduced by *si* (17): Asin. 414, si quidem summum Iovem te dicas detinuisse atque is precator adsiet, malam rem effugies numquam; Aul. 100, si Bona Fortuna veniat, ne intromiseris! 555, quos si Argus servet, is numquam servet; Bacch. 128, qui si decem habeas linguas, mutum esse addecet; 697; Asin. 318; Bacch. 1045; Cist. 3; Cure. 211; Merc. 841; Pseud. 433; H. T. 452, satrapa si siet amator, numquam sufferre eius sumptus queat; 632, si tu neges, certo scio; 1035; Eun. 49, non (redeam), si me obsecret; Ad. 761, ipsa si cupiat Salus, servare prorsus non potest hanc familiam.

b) Introduced by *etsi* (5): Aul. 421, etsi taceas, palam id quidem est; Trin. 474, etsi votet, edim; Truc. 815, etsi tu taceas, intellego. In Capt. 856 and Vid. Frag. xiii, the apodosis is a dependent clause of result, and the subjunctive protasis may be due to attraction.

c) Introduced by *tametsi*: Trin. 679, datur ignis, tam etsi ab inimico petas (indef. 2d sing.); Eun. 216, memini, tam etsi nullus moneas.

d) Introduced by *etiamsi*: only Ad. 851, etiam si nolit, cogam.

¹ Kriege, *De enuntiatis concessivis apud Plautum et Terentium*; Nutting, *Concessive si-clauses in Plautus*, University of California Publications, Classical Philology, i, p. 35 ff.

Subjunctive Protasis with Indicative Apodosis.¹

The material falling under this head has been cited with considerable fullness above, p. 274 ff. Concerning the significance of the phenomenon, there has been much discussion. Lillie (op. cit.) defended the theory that in periods of the type under consideration the apodosis is expressed absolutely, i.e. without reference to the content of the protasis, a view which subsequent scholars have justly rejected. Lodge (op. cit., p. 255 ff.) seems to explain the indicative partly as due to the future outlook of the verb, partly as involving an unexpressed apodosis.

The most complete and satisfactory treatment of this question is by Nutting (University of California Publications, Classical Philology, i, p. 50 ff.). Nutting, p. 65, in summing up the reasons why certain conditional sentences in Plautus fail to conform to the logical norm, recognizes four grounds:

1. "The fact that the state of affairs mentioned in the apodosis is often in no way dependent on the truth of the protasis; the indicative statement includes and implies what *would be* in the supposed case," e.g. M. G. 764, *otium rei si sit, possum expromere*, where, as Nutting observes, "the speaker's fund of information is a fact uninfluenced by the truth or falsity of the condition."

2. "The modal meaning of certain verbs, notably *posse*."

3. "The union of a complete sentence and a part of another by anacoluthon. The form of each member of the expression is determined by the thought it is to convey, irrespective of the other member," e.g. Capt. 850, *scis bene esse, si sit unde*; M. G. 1263, *non tu magis amas quam ego, si per te liceat*; Stich. 171, *nunc si ridiculum hominem quaerat quispiam, venalis ego sum*. Cf. Blase, Studien u. Kritiken, p. 52, where Epid. 730, *invitus do hanc veniam tibi, nisi cogar* is explained as a contamination of *invitus do, sed cogor* and *nisi cogar, non dem*.

4. "The somewhat undeveloped state of the language in Plautus's day, as shown (a) in irregular sentence structure and (b) in the not very precise use of mood forms. This method of explanation finds its most sweeping application in cases referring to the future; for

¹ For the literature on this topic, see above, p. 274. Also especially Wimmerer, Wiener Studien, xxvii, p. 264; Sjögren, Gebrauch des Futurums, p. 119.

there the fact that the realms of indicative and subjunctive were not carefully differentiated tended to make the lack of symmetry in sentence structure still less noticeable to Plautus than it would otherwise have been."

Besides the foregoing four lines of explanation of the employment of the indicative in combination with a subjunctive protasis, Nutting also calls attention to the large number of protases with adversative ('concessive') force. In these the absence of formal symmetry is less striking, since, as Nutting (op. cit. p. 67) remarks, "the conclusion refers regularly to a state of affairs actually existing and which would continue to exist despite the coming to pass of what is supposed in the *si*-clause."

Another important category comprises those conditional periods in which an indicative apodosis is combined with a subjunctive protasis in the indefinite 2d singular. See below, p. 319.

Dependent Conditional Sentences.

Conditional sentences often become dependent. As a rule their form under these circumstances offers nothing worthy of note. The following examples, however, deserve attention:

1. **The apodosis serves as an indirect question:** Capt. 712, cogitato, si quis tuos servos faxit, qualem haberes gratiam; Cist. 3, soror si mea esses, qui magis potueris mi honorem ire habitum, nescio; Pers. 296, scis quid dicturus fuerim, ni linguae moderarier queam; And. 258, si rescissem, quid facerem, si quis roget; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 233, si vellem verba facere, haud scio an impetrassem.

2. **The apodosis is a result clause:** Phor. 108, vestitus turpis (erat), ut, ni vis boni in ipsa inesset forma, haec formam exstinguere; Hec. 128, ita aegre tulit, ut, si adesset, commiseresceret; Ad. 273, ut, si omnes cupere, nil possent.

3. And. 530, haud dubiumst quin, si nolit, possim; Ad. 299, nunc est illud quom, si conferant, nil adferant; Trin. 1170, metuo, si denegem, ne putes; Cas. 260, quid iam? : quia, si facias recte, me sinas curare ancillas; Pers. 172, te iam sector quintum annum, quom interea, credo, ovis si in ludum iret, potuisset iam fieri ut litteras sciret; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem, si elocutus essem? (= *peribo si elocutus ero*, dependent on a past tense).

CLAUSES OF CONDITIONAL COMPARISON.¹

These seem to have originated by ellipsis from ordinary conditional clauses. Thus Aul. 369, *verba facio quasi negoti nil siet*, is equivalent to *verba facio, ut faciam, si negoti nil siet*.²

1. With *quasi* (112).

a) *quasi*, 'as if,' (87).

1) A main clause, often with *tam, ita, sic, proinde, sirempse*, etc., corresponds to the *quasi*-clause.

Present tense: Amph. 56, *sed ego stultior, quasi nesciam vos velle*; Aul. 719, *sedent quasi frugi sint*; Curc. 51, *tam a me pudicast quasi soror mea sit*; Merc. 314, *plane decrepitus senex tantidemst, quasi sit signum pictum in pariete*; Poen. 845, *proinde habet orationem quasi ipse sit frugi bonae*; And. 548, *te oro in commune ut consulas, quasi illa tua sit*; H. T. 65, *proinde, quasi nemo siet, ita attente tute illorum officia fungere*; 527; Cato, Agr. 77, *cetera omnia, quasi placentam facias, facito*; Enn. Trag. 367, *quasi lumen de suo lumine accendat, facit*.

Perfect tense: Amph. 683, *sic salutas quasi dudum non videris*; Men. 1101, *tam quasi me emeris argento, servibo tibi*; Merc. 204; M. G. 934, *hanc ad nos mittitote, quasi clanculum missa sit*; Poen. 831, *quodvis genus ibi hominum videas, quasi Acheruntem veneris*; Amph. 74, *sirempse legem iussit esse Iuppiter, quasi ambiverit*; Ad. 290, *iam nunc times quasi numquam adfueris*; Cato, Agr. 156, 1, *reddet te, quasi nihil ederis*.

Imperfect and pluperfect tenses (rare): Amph. 1096, *aedes totae confulgebant, quasi essent aureae*; Capt. 417, *quasi servos esses, mihi opsequiosus fuisti*; Epid. 248, *coepe ad eos accedere, quasi retruderet med hominum vis*; Men. 482, *quasi res cum ea esset, coepe adsentari*; Epid. 389, *coeperam med exercuciare quasi quid filius meus deliquisset*. For instances of the imperfect and pluperfect following a principal tense, see below.

2) Without governing clause; used especially to characterize some statement or suggestion as absurd: Amph. 89, *quasi vero novom*

¹ Sven Tessing, *Syntaxis Plautina*, p. 66 f. Fuhrmann, *De particularum comparativarum usu Plautino*, 1869.

² For a different view, see Hale, *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, xiii, p. 62 ff.

proferatur; Cas. 333, quasi tu nescias; Epid. 226, quasi non fundis exornatae multae incedant; Men. 669, quasi non habeam alium locum; 639; Most. 1178, quasi non cras commeream aliam noxiam; Poen. 272, quasi bella sit, quasi reges ductitent; Pseud. 632, quasi mi non sescenta tanta soli soleant credier; 609; 684; Rud. 99, quasi me tuom esse servom dicas; so Trin. 891; And. 372, quasi necessus sit; 502, quasi dicas; 544; H. T. 587, quasi desit locus; 720; Eun. 685, quasi vero paulum intersiet; Hec. 110, quasi tu non multo malis; Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae; 271; perfect: Merc. 957, quasi tu numquam quicquam adsimile feceris; Truc. 292, quasi vero corpori reliqueris tuo potestatem coloris ulli capiendi; And. 499, quasi non renuntiata sint haec.

b) *quasi*, 'than if': Aul. 231, tu me magis haud respicias gnatus quasi numquam siem; Trin. 266, peius perit quasi saxo saliat; Truc. 340, me nemo magis respiciet quasi abhinc ducentos annos fuerim mortuos.

c) Introducing substantive clauses. See Bennett, Die mit *tamquam* und *quasi* eingeleiteten Substantivsätze, Wölfflin's Archiv, xi, p. 405 ff.

With *simulo*: Pers. 84, simulabo quasi non videam; Asin. 796; Pers. 677; Curc. 391; M. G. 796; 909; Amph. 200, quasi adfuerim simulabo.

With *adsimulo*: M. G. 1181, adsimulato quasi gubernator sies; Amph. 115; M. G. 1170; Poen. 600; Epid. 195; M. G. 1163; Stich. 84, adsimulabo quasi quam culpam admiserint; Eun. 461.

With *dissimulo*: Cas. 771, dissimulat quasi nil sciat; M. G. 992, dissimulato quasi non videam.

With *consimile est*: M. G. 820, consimilest quom stertas quasi sorbeas. The *quasi*-clause here stands in the relation of a genitive dependent upon *consimile*.

Less certain, but to my mind of like nature, are the following: Pseud. 1162, allegavit hunc quasi a milite esset; Trin. 1142, meo adlegatu venit quasi qui aurum mihi ferret; Epid. 370, caput imprudens alligabit quasi argentum acceperit; Poen. 1102, adseras quasi filiae tuae sint.

d) *quasi si*: Amph. 1078, nec secus est quasi si ab Acherunte veniam; Cas. 45, educavit quasi si esset ex se nata. The psychological process which has produced the redundant *si* is not clear.

2. With *quam si* (12).

a) *quam si*, 'as if,' formula of adrogatio in Gell. v, 19, uti tam filius sit quam si ex eo natus esset; Men. 969, uti tutetur quam si adsit; Scipio, Meyer, p. 212, filium adoptivom tam procedere, quam si ex se natum habeat.

b) *quam si*, 'than if': Bacch. 518, nihilo pluris referet quam si mortuo narret logos; 410; Capt. 273, nec secus erat quam si essem familiaris; Pers. 354; Pseud. 102; Rud. 218; 410; Trin. 410; Eun. 62, nihilo plus agas quam si des; Cato, Agr. 69, 2, minus quam si picare velis.

3. With *ut si* (6). Not found before Terence. Eun. 116, coepit studiose omnia docere ut si esset filia; Phor. 409, itidem ut cognata si sit, abduc hanc; Lucil. 9, 7, insidias facere ut si hostes sint; 274; 458; 576 (uti, *codd.*).

4. With *tamquam*: Pers. 638, tamquam quaeras; Cato, Agr. 87, facito tamquam faex fiat.

5. With *tamquam si*: Most. 402, tamquam si nemo in aedibus habitet; Asin. 427, tamquam si claudus sim, est ambulandum.

6. With *ac si*: Hec. 279, numquam secus habui ac si ex me esset nata.

7. With *ut quasi si*: Asin. 838, quem videam aequae esse maestum, ut quasi dies si dicta sit.

As regards the employment of tenses in these clauses of conditional comparison, there is little to note. In the main, usage conforms to the regularly recognized classical standard, i.e. the present and perfect are used after principal tenses, where English usage would lead us to expect the imperfect and pluperfect. The only exceptions that I have noted are: Rud. 218, qui minus servio quam si serva forem nata? old formula in Gellius, v, 19, uti tam filius siet quam si ex eo natus esset; Phor. 382, proinde expiscare quasi non nosses; 388, quasi non nosses, advenis; CIL, i, 202, I, 39, sirempse iuus lexque esto, quasi si ei viatores in eam decuriam antea lectei sublectei essent.

DESCRIPTIVE CLAUSES.

The name "descriptive" is applied to those clauses which express a characteristic or quality of a person or thing. The designation is due to Professor Hale, who in his earlier syntactical work employed also the names, "characterizing" and "qualitative." Descriptive clauses are opposed to 'determinative,' clauses, which simply add another fact or item with regard to a person or thing. Professor Hale (Hale-Buck, *Lat. Gramm.*, p. 260, footnote) defines the determinative clause as one telling what person or thing is meant; while the descriptive clause is defined as designating what kind of person or thing is meant.

Descriptive clauses may be introduced not merely by the relative pronoun, but also by various relative adverbs, as *ubi*, *unde*, *quo*, etc. Theoretically any type of independent subjunctive may appear in a descriptive clause. But as a matter of fact the usage is confined mainly to developments of the 'should' - 'would' potential.

Classification of Subjunctive Descriptive Clauses.

1. Potential Descriptive Clauses (Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, p. 88).

a) Present Tense (49): *Asin.* 118, *servos peior . . . nec quo ab caveas aegrius*. Here the idea is: 'nor against whom you would find it harder to be on your guard.' Other examples are: *Aul.* 320, *sescenta sunt quae memorem, si sit otium*; 420; *Capt.* 346, *neque quemquam fideliozem neque quoi plus credat*; 348; *Cist.* 110; 545; *Epid.* 258, *consilium dederim quod laudetis*; *Men.* 220; *M. G.* 686; *Pseud.* 599; *Rud.* 211; 1073; 1322; *Phor.* 488, *dicam quod libenter audias*; 554; *Ad.* 299, *nunc illud est quom nil adferant*; *Naev. Com.* 98, *illo te ducam ubi non despuas*; *Curc.* 481, *ibi sunt quos credas male*; *Afran.* 396.

Especially common in this use are phrases like *nihil est quod malim*, e.g. *Asin.* 877; *Bacch.* 859; 875; *Capt.* 516, *nunc illud est quom mavelim*; *And.* 963; *H. T.* 267; *Hec.* 794; *Capt.* 53, *est quod vos monitos voluerim*; 700; *Cas.* 183a; 951.

Further with expressions of being able, daring, e.g. *Pers.* 27, *cum eis belligerem quibus sat esse non queam*? *Most.* 354, *ecquis est qui possit*? *H. T.* 574, *nemost apud quem audeam*.

In all these the idea is of future contingency, not of actuality.

b) Imperfect Tense (6): Eun. 333, nisi nunc quom minume vellem; 561, nemost quem magis cuperem; 686, adulescentulus quem tu videre velles; 1002; Hec. 756, faciam quod alia non faceret; Scipio (Meyer, p. 215), vidi saltare, quam saltationem impudicus servulus honeste saltare non posset.

All of these are simply contrary-to-fact apodoses (with omitted protasis), introduced by a relative.

2. Descriptive Clauses of Fact (Clauses of Characteristic).¹

This is a very large category in Early Latin. It seems to have developed from the previous type (Potential Descriptive Clauses). Thus under the head of Potential Descriptive Clauses we noticed the frequency of the type in which the verb of the dependent clause was *malim*, *velim*, *possim*, *audeam*, etc. Now it is a peculiarity of these verbs that the force of potentiality is exceedingly slight,—so slight in fact that it easily passes into that of actuality. Thus Acc. 538, quem neque tueri contra neque fari queas, almost inevitably passes from the meaning ‘whom you would not be able to face’ into, ‘whom you *are* not able to (cannot) face.’ Similarly Capt. 618, si quid est quod me velis, ‘if there is anything which you would wish of me,’ naturally becomes, ‘if there is anything which you wish.’² Cf. also Cure. 171, haud quicquamst magis quod cupiam; Pers. 489, numquam quod nolis volam; Trin. 801, tacere numquam quicquamst quod queat; Lucil. 517, quod si observas hominem qui audeat. I have noted in all some 34 examples of this kind. See in addition to the examples cited: Capt. 154; Cas. 133; Cure. 171; 479; Men. 53; Merc. 145; 453; M. G. 329; 685; Pseud. 827; Rud. 390; 1110; Stich. 769; Trin. 155; And. 31; 45; Eun. 272; Phor. 279; 697; Hec. 240; 573; 608; 750; Enn. Ann. 194, 10; Cato, Agr. 11, 1.

After the descriptive clause of fact once became thoroughly established within the limits just indicated, it naturally extended its scope further, and came to be employed with great freedom in other verbs than those in connection with which it arose.

¹ See especially Hale, *Cum-Constructions*, p. 90 f.

² The theory of Dittmar (*Studien zur Lateinischen Moduslehre*, p. 97 ff.), that these clauses had a deliberative origin, seems to me lacking in probability. Equally so the theory of Bottek (*Ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Conjunctivs in lateinischen Nebensätzen*, 1899, p. 33), that the origin is to be sought in interrogative potentials, i.e. that in *nemo exstat qui ibi vixerit*, for example, the original meaning was, ‘Who can have lived there? No one.’ Any such use of the potential is unknown in independent clauses in Latin, and therefore practically impossible in dependent clauses.

In its developed form it occurs in the following categories :

a) *Nullus qui, non ullus qui, nemo qui, non quisquam qui, nihil quod, non quicquam quod.*

1) Introduced by *qui* (*quae, quod*) : Amph. 509, nullast quam aequae diligam; Aul. 419, homo nullust qui vivat hodie; Bacch. 543, nullus est quoi non invideant; Cas. 218, nec quicquam quod plus salis habeat; Trin. 543, nemo exstat qui vixerit; Truc. 717, nec quemquam qui sit odio intro mittam; Phor. 738, nihil est quod verear; Hec. 782, nil est quod sit dignum; Pseud. 774; Stich. 260; Trin. 357; 1126; H. T. 988; Eun. 41; 325; 757; Ad. 932; Naev. Trag. 58; Cato, Agr. 54, 5.

2) Introduced by *quin*¹ = *qui non*, Amph. 1054, neque ullast confidentia quin (= quam non) amiserim; Bacch. 336, nullust quin sciat; 210, non intermittit tempus quin (= quo non) eum nominet; 1012, nil est quin dixerim; Cas. 199, nihil quin subtrahat; Cist. 16, nec fuit quicquam quin placeret; Stich. 208, nemost quin sit malevolus; H. T. 1021, nil est relictum quin sit idem tibi; Hec. 67; Lucil. 8, nemo sit quin sit pater.

b) *quis est qui?*

1) Introduced by *qui*, Amph. 856, ecquis alius Sosia intust qui mei similis siet? Aul. 810, quis quoi di sint propitii? Bacch. 92, quid est quod metuas? So Poen. 884; Bacch. 807; Cas. 750, numquid est ceterum quod morae siet? Curc. 23; 86, quisnam istie fluvius quem non recipiat mare? 301; Epid. 108; 168; Rud. 315; Truc. 295; H. T. 1008, quid est quod peccem? Eun. 995, num quid est aliud quod non dixeris?

2) Introduced by *quin*: H. T. 193, quid relicuist quin habeat? Eun. 179, quam rem voluisti quin perfeceris?

Rarely the indicative occurs, e.g. Acc. 458, quis erit qui non differet?

c) *Unus qui, solus qui*: Curc. 248, solus hic homost qui sciat; And. 973, solus est quem di diligant; Lucil. 330, unus modo qui ingenio sit. A single instance of *quin* occurs, Ad. 293, numquam unum intermittit diem quin (= quo non) semper veniat.

d) *Si est qui*, Amph. 271, si quicquamst aliud quod credam; Cist. 67, si quid est quod doleat; Epid. 526; And. 41; 981; H. T. 1024; Eun. 1; Phor. 12.

¹ See Brugmann, Indogerman. Forschungen, iv, p. 226 ff.

e) *Is qui, ille qui, iste qui*: Capt. 271, proximum quod sit bono, id volo; 473, eos requirunt qui reddant; H. T. 142; Phor. 917, quo redibo ore ad eam quam contempserim? Stich. 261, reliqui ecillam quae dicat; Pseud. 1085. By an extension of usage we also find *id quod* in determinative clauses with the subjunctive, e.g. Ad. 236, enumerasti id quod ad te rediturum putes? Truc. 296, quid id, obsecro, quod scias?

f) *Pauci qui*: Pseud. 390, pauci sunt qui certi sient; Trin. 221, pauci sint qui sciant. This last may be due to attraction, though it seems probable that the subjunctive would be used apart from this. In Eun. 581, paucae, quae circum illam essent, manent, we have by analogy a determinative clause in the subjunctive.

g) *Alius qui*: Cist. 231, aliorum adfatimst qui faciant; Truc. 81, alium repperit qui plus daret.

h) *Multi qui*: H. T. 232, concurrunt multae opinionem res quae exaugeant; Enn. Trag. 221, multi qui domi aetatem agerent, propter ea sunt improbat; Pers. 8.

i) *Aliquis qui*: Hec. 550, ex aliquo qui diceret; 652, quom esset aliquis qui te appellaret patrem. This last example might be explained by attraction.

j) Clause following an indefinite antecedent denoting a person or thing.

1) Introduced by *qui*. Examples of this class are very numerous: Cas. 194, ancillula quae meast, quae meo sumptu educta siet; Amph. 824, mihi adsunt testes qui adsentiant; 826, alius Amphitruo qui tuam rem curet teque absente munus fungatur tuum; Asin. 85, servum quoi plus in manu sit quam tibi; Aul. 522; Bacch. 991; Capt. 179, meliorem quae mi placeat condicio magis; 466, neque ieiuniosorem (diem) nec quoi minus procedat; 614, garriet quoi neque pes umquam compareat; Men. 456, adfatimst hominum qui singulas escas edint; Poen. 1174; 1417, dabo quae placeat; Pseud. 392, exquire unum qui certus siet; 725; Rud. 128, qui mulierculas duas secum adduxit quique adornaret sibi ut rem divinam faciat; 313, adulescentem fortem qui tris semihomines duceret; 319, probrum plenum qui duceret mulierculas duas secum; Trin. 1019, hominibus qui facile cohiberent manus; H. T. 596, repperisti tibi quod placeat; Eun. 449, facile fit quod doleat; Phor. 170, beatus, nisi unum desit,

animus qui istaec ferat; 522; Afran. 62, non desunt mihi qui dent; Cato, Agr. 35, 1, in loco qui herbosus non siet; 76, 3, in tabula pura quae pateat pedem; 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

By an extension of usage we find also determinative clauses in the subjunctive, e.g. Poen. 441, credin quod ego fabuler? Eun. 705, credis huic quod dicat? So also 711; Acc. 215; Trin. 207, sciunt id quod rex reginae dixerit, where Brix, following Reiz, reads *quid* for the Mss. *id quod*.

2) Introduced by *ubi*, Asin. 174, neque fictum neque scriptum ubi lena bene agat; Capt. 327, est ubi praestet; 1034; 1032; Pers. 76; Pseud. 215; Truc. 72; Ad. 434; Cato, Agr. 35, 1, in loco celso ubi sol quam diutissime siet; 151, 2, in loco ubi terra tenerrima erit, ubi aqua propter siet. Note here the alternation between the future indicative and the subjunctive.

3) Introduced by *quom*, Most. 158, nec quom me melius rear esse defecatum; H. T. 559, neque commodius erum audiui loqui neque quom male facere crederem mi impunius licere; Hec. 658, nunc quom sentiam; Laelius (Meyer, p. 208), in eodem tempore periit quom vivo opus esset. Most. 691, melius anno hoc non fuit nec quom (Mss, *quod*) una esca me iuverit magis, may also be put here. *Quod* seems to me an impossible reading.

4) Introduced by *unde*: Epid. 80, numquam hominem conveni unde abierim lubentius; Cato, Agr. 42, eum locum unde exsicaveris.

The indicative also occurs in descriptive clauses of the foregoing type, e.g. Cist. 74, si medicus veniat qui huic morbo facere medicinam potest; Trin. 547, istest ager in quem omnis mitti decet; Capt. 1000, ibi demumst locus ubi labore lassitudost exigunda ex corpore; Merc. 838, ubi mores deteriores increbrescent, ubique id eripiat quod placeat maxume ibi non cupitast civitas.

k) Descriptive Clauses with an Accessory Notion of Cause ('since') or Opposition ('though').

1) Causal Clauses. Descriptive clauses with the accessory notion of cause are very common in Early Latin. The causal notion develops purely as a result of the context. Thus Aul. 769, sanus tu non es qui furem me voces; literally, 'you, the sort of person who calls me thief.' Cf. Bacch. 91, sumne nihili qui nequeam? 584, te qui viris tuas extentes; 845, non me militem

sed mulierem qui non queam defendere; Afran. 45, di sunt tibi irati qui cogites.

The reason or cause expressed by these clauses is regularly not the motive or impelling cause of action, but the ground for the assertion made by the speaker. It is striking too that the large majority of these clauses stand in either the first or second persons; i.e. 'you, a person of the sort that,' or, 'I, a person of the sort that;' secondarily, 'since you,' 'since I.' The following citations are classified according to persons.¹

First Person, Bacch. 1132, merito hoc nobis fit qui quidem huc venerimus; Cas. 619, ego, quoi sic eveniant morae; Cist. 680; Epid. 581; Men. 443, inscitus qui postulem; Merc. 701, miserior me quae nupserim; 920, ego stultior qui credam; M. G. 32; 370; 443; Poen. 986, qui scire potui qui sexennis perierim? Pseud. 908; Trin. 929; 937; 1057; And. 97, laudare fortunas meas, qui haberem; 664, mi iratos qui auscultaverim; 750; H. T. 684, quid ni? : : qui adfuerim; 710; Eun. 303; 1033, in me quoi tot congruerint commoda; Ad. 268; 368, mihi qui dedissem egit gratias; Bacch. 511.

Second person, Amph. 1021, tibi di irati sunt, qui sic frangas foris; Bacch. 1169, non homo tuquidem es qui appelles; Capt. 546, si te odit, qui istum appelles Tyndarum; 565; Curc. 66; iniuriu's qui petas; 551; 654, sanan es quae isti committas? Epid. 326, absurde facis qui angas te; Men. 312, non sanus satis qui male dicas tibi; 323; 806; 818; Merc. 292; 686; M. G. 58, amant ted omnes qui sis tam pulcer; 435; 963; Most. 188, erras quae exspectes atque morem geras; 194, stulta's quae putes; 208; Pers. 667; Rud. 104, utrum tu masne an femina, qui illum patrem voces? 1147; True. 730; And. 749, sanu's qui me rogites? H. T. 519, te miror qui tantum biberis; 565; 897; 1011; Eun. 802, miseret tui me qui facias; Phor. 471, te incusamus qui abieris; Ad. 852, fortunatus qui isto animo sies; Acc. 554.

Third Person, Amph. 506, hic scitust sycophanta qui quidem meus sit pater; Epid. 574, quor non, quae quidem ex te nata sit; Men. 373, ebriast quae compellet me; M. G. 406; Pers. 699, persim-

¹ The theory of Guthmann (Eine Art missbilligender Fragen, p. 3), that in a sentence like *stultus es qui putes* there is an historical connection with the repudiating questions, lacks plausibility.

ilem tui : : quippe qui frater siet; Rud. 118, istie infortunium (volo), qui praefestinet praeloqui; 1113, istae mutae sunt quae pro se fabulari non queant? Stich. 555; Trin. 552; Ad. 65, errat qui credat.

All of the foregoing examples are introduced by relative pronouns. A single instance of a relative adverb occurs in Truc. 353, num tibi ianuast mordax quo intro ire metuas.

The indicative is also not infrequent in clauses of the same meaning, e.g. Pers. 75, sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam? Stich. 558; p. 137 f. Sometimes the two moods alternate, as Eun. 302, ut illum di perdant, qui me remoratus est; et me qui restiterim; Men. 456.

2) **Adversative Clauses.** These are much less frequent in Early Latin than causal descriptive clauses. So also in later Latin, adversative descriptive clauses are relatively less frequent than causal descriptive clauses. Examples: Amph. 178, hodie qui fuerim liber, eum nunc potivit pater servitutis; 56, quasi nesciam vos velle qui divos siem; 153, qui me alter est audacior homo, iuventutis mores qui sciam ('although I know'), qui hoc noctis solus ambulem? Bacch. 331, divesne est? : : qui auro habeat suppactum solum? M. G. 530, ut pote quae non sit eadem; so in Cist. 317, editors generally read suspiciost eam esse ut pote quam numquam viderim. *Ut pote* is Seyffert's conjecture; the Mss. have *postquam*. Further examples are: M. G. 566, etiam quod sciam; Poen. 234, te sic fabulari quae tam callida sis; Stich. 395, Hercules, qui deus sies, discessisti non bene; Truc. 587, tu ais, quae sis stabulum flagiti? Phor. 60.

The indicative is also found in relative clauses with adversative force; see p. 142.

1) *Sunt qui* in Early Latin is regularly followed by the indicative.

3. **Jussive Descriptive Clauses.** Material falling under this head is scanty. Examples: M. G. 140, conclave dedit quo nemo inferret pedem. This seems to go back to an original, *conclave quo nemo inferat pedem* ('a room into which let no one set foot'). To the same category probably belong also the following examples from Cato: Agr. 21, 1, cupam facito media inter orbis quae conveniat; 2, tabulam ferream figito quae in columellam conveniat. Less certain is the following: Bacch. 67, (palaestra) ubi pro disco damnum capiam . . . ubi pro insigni sit corolla plectilis, pro lorica capiam pallium, ubi lectus detur, scortum accubet.

4. Deliberative Descriptive Clauses. Here I should put the following: Aul. 735, *quid de te demerui, quam ob rem ita faceres?* This, I should regard as a dependent past form of an original *quam ob rem ita facias* ('why should you do so?'). Poen. 276, *quid habetis qui mage immortalis vos credam esse?* Ad. 592, *nil reperio quam ob rem lauder.* In all these the original interrogative of the deliberative has in the process of development come to be felt as relative.

5. Optative Descriptive Clauses: Pers. 823, *di faciant ut id bibatis quod numquam transeat* ('what I hope will never go through').

OTHER RELATIVE CLAUSES.

1. Jussive: Cato, Agr. 20, 2, *cunicas soldas facito, quas figat clavis duplicibus* ('which let him fasten').

2. Optative: Asin. 2, *quae res bene vortat*; so also, Aul. 788; Capt. 361; Cure. 729; Pers. 329; Trin. 500; 572; Aul. 218, *quae res recte vortat*; Phor. 678, *quae res vortat male*; Ad. 191; Cure. 273; Amph. 461, *quod illi faxit Iuppiter*; Aul. 147; Cas. 382; 402; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, *quod bene eveniat*; And. 568, *quod di prohibeant*; Eun. 466.

3. Potential: Hec. 330, *si factus siet, quod nolim*; Lucil. 194, *dies hic, quem hexametro non dicere possis*; Statius, 79; Cure. 291, *incedunt cum suis sententiis, quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermipolio.*

RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES.¹

Many descriptive clauses develop secondarily a restrictive notion, e.g. Men. 1106, *nil reticebo quod sciam*, 'nothing that I know,' and secondarily, 'nothing, so far as I know'; Pseud. 1076, *nullumst periculum quod sciam*, 'which I know,' and secondarily, 'so far as I know'; Acc. Praetext. 1, *nil periculi est quod sciam*; Cato, Agr. 148, 1, *quod neque aceat neque muceat id dabitur*; Men. 297, *tantum quod sciam*; so Merc. 642; Capt. 265, *non ero (falsiloquos), i.e. nihil falsum dicam, quod sciam*. From expressions like these the step was easy and natural to others like: Amph. 749, *numquam factumst quod sciam*; so Capt. 173; Men. 500, *non edepol ego te quod sciam vidi*; Men. 503, *vigilo quod sciam*; Most. 1010, *minas lx accepisti quod sciam*; Truc. 199, *uterum, quod sciam, numquam*

¹ Hale, *The Mode in the Phrases quod sciam, etc.*, Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxii, p. 105 ff.; *Cum-Konstruktionen*, p. 340.

extumescere sensi; Ad. 641, non istas (pepuli) quod sciam; Men. 925, intestinas tibi crepant quod sentias? Hec. 863, numquam eam, quod nossem, videram; Epid. 638, non me novisti? :: (non) quod quidem nunc veniat in mentem mihi; Merc. 1022, scortum ducat quod bono fiat modo; Poen. 440, quod inter nos liceat; And. 454, quod dicendum hic siet; CIL, i, 198, 69, quod sine malo peqlatu fiat; 199, 25, sei non dabunt neque satis facient arbitrato Genuatium, quod per Genuenses mora non fiat; i, 200, 2, agrum, quod non modus maior siet; old Fetial formula in Livy, i, 24, quod sine fraude mea fiat, facio; Cato, Agr. 16, dominus lapidem, ligna, quod opus siet, praebet; Poen. 1213, amicus vobis. :: quiquidem inimicus non siet.

SUBJUNCTIVE IN RESULT CLAUSES.

The clause of result is closely related to the predicative descriptive clause (clause of characteristic), and is probably a development of the potential subjunctive. Thus in a sentence like *hoc flagitium tale est ut quivis oderit*, the original meaning, I take it, was: 'this outrage is of such a nature as¹ any one you please would hate it,' i.e. if he should see it. From this, to the meaning 'of such a nature that anybody you please *hates* it,' is an easy transition. In our study of the descriptive clause of fact (p. 289), we saw that certain potentials, particularly *velit*, *malit*, *nolit*, *audeat*, *possit*, *credat*, *putet*, lent themselves readily to this transition from the idea of contingency to that of actuality. It seems likely that the clause of result has developed by this same process of transition, and in the case of the same verbs. Thus in an original, *nemo est tam audax ut hoc facere audeat*, the meaning 'as would dare' naturally becomes 'that he dares.' So in the case of *nemo est tam fortis ut hoc facere possit*; *nemo est tam stultus ut velit*; *nemo est tam stultus ut nolit*; *ut malit*; *ut putet*; *ut credat*; etc. By this process of transition a new syntactical type arises, and *ut* relative becomes *ut* consecutive. After the construction once became established it naturally extended itself far beyond its original bounds, and was employed freely in any context.² In Early Latin, however, the type which I have assumed

¹ *Ut* in such sentences seems to have been originally relative.

² The foregoing view still seems to me the more probable despite Schlicher (Classical Philology, ii, p. 79 ff.) and Dittmar (Studien zur lat. Moduslehre, p. 87 f.), both of whom refer the construction to the repudiating question for its origin.

as original is still strikingly prevalent. Out of some 106 instances of result clauses introduced by *ut*, no fewer than 30 contain the verbs to which I would refer the origin of the construction (*possit*, *audeat*, *velit*, etc.). Many of these are of the original type, and exhibit the ease with which the transition referred to could take place, e.g. Merc. 36, adeost facundus ut possit loqui ('so eloquent as would be able,' i.e. so eloquent that he can); M. G. 1174, ita expolitum ut non queas; Phor. 240, ita sum irritatus ut nequeam; 497, adeon ut neque queas; and many others.

Equally clear is the potential origin in relative clauses of result, e.g. Amph. 985, nec quisquam tam audax fuat homo qui obsistat mihi; Cure. 284; Trin. 954, an ille tam esset stultus qui crederet? Phor. 821, eius modi cupiditates quas mederi possis; Rud. 645, quis est tanta confidentia qui audeat; H. T. 675, nil tam difficilest quin¹ investigari possiet. Out of 29 relative clauses of result in Early Latin, 14 point to the original type. In many cases some interpreters might prefer to recognize the potential character of the dependent clause as still persisting.

Result Clauses Introduced by *ut*.²

1. With a preceding intensive word.

a) With *ita* (25).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Aul. 591, ita dormitet ut cogitet; Bacch. 477, ita gerere ut teneat; Cas. 125; Poen. 1294; H. T. 503; Ad. 520.

2) Negative, e.g. Men. 19, ita simili ut non posset; M. G. 1174; Rud. 730, ita te ornatum amittam ut te non noveris; Eun. 869; Gracchus (Meyer, p. 229), ita versatus sum ut nemo possit. In Phor. 974, we have illam ita incensam dabo ut ne restinguas. If *ut ne* is what Terence wrote, it is unaccountable and unexampled.

b) With *adeo* (18).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Asin. 284, adeo ut sint obnoxii; Bacch. 283, adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem; Merc. 36; Phor. 497; Hec. 532.

2) Negative, e.g. And. 278, adeo ingratum ut neque amor neque pudor commoveat; Eun. 226.

¹ For *quin* as a relative (= *qui non*), see p. 290.

² Substantive Clauses of Result are treated below.

c) With *tantus* (8).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Asin. 313, tantum facinus inveni ut nos dicamur; And. 626; H. T. 75.

2) Negative, e.g. H. T. 710, tantam potestatem ut non credat; Ad. 610b, hocine tantum ut neque certum sit; Stat. 249, tantam rem ut pro nilo habuerit.

d) With *is* (8).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Cas. 47, adolevit ad eam aetatem ut placere posset; Poen. 1201, non eo genere sumus ut deceat; H. T. 359; Phor. 979.

2) Negative: Phor. 175, in eum incidi locum ut neque sit amittendi nec retinendi copia; Ad. 273, in eum locum redisse ut nil possent auxiliarier.

e) With other words: Hec. 108, tam commode ut committam; Asin. 794, ne sic tussiat ut linguam proserat; Pseud. 929, sic in timorem dabo ut neget neque autumet; Cato, Agr. 158, 2, tot rebus ut bene deicias.

2. Without correlative particle.

a) Affirmative (29), e.g. Pseud. 464, te conficiet ut censeas; 588, praeda onerabo ut sciant; Trin. 76, morbum incuties ut aegroti sient; Hec. 60, iurabat ut quivis posset credere; Ad. 823; Cato, Agr. 151, 4, si non pluet ut terra sitiatur; CIL, i, 38, optenui laudem ut laetentur.

b) Negative (11), e.g. Men. 712, quid admisi ut non audeam; M. G. 71; H. T. 394, devincimini ut numquam possit; 881, ex tuo ingenio iudicas ut nil credas intellegere; 899, ut ne . . . quidem subolat; Eun. 841, ut nullo modo possem; Hec. 2, intervenit ut neque potuerit.

Relative Clauses of Result.

1. Introduced by *qui* (13), e.g. Amph. 985, nec quisquam tam audax fuat homo qui obsistat mihi; Cure. 284; Trin. 954; H. T. 679; Phor. 822; Pers. 583, numquam tam benignus fuit qui fuerit propitius; Cato, Agr. 156, 3.

2. Introduced by *qui non* (2), Truc. 355, quid tam inficetur's qui non des; Acc. 683.

3. Introduced by *ubi*: Stich. 62, tantillum loci ubi catellus cubet.

4. Introduced by *quin* (12), e.g. Asin. 944, nec quisquamst tam ingenio duro quin faciat; Aul. 790, nullus tam parvi preti quin purget

sese; Capt. 408; Merc. 362; Ad. 221; Lucil. 140, nulla potest mulier tam corpore duro esse, tamen tenero manet quin (= cui non) sucus lacerto.

In these clauses of relative result an intensifying word is invariably present in the antecedent clause. *Tam*, which was rare in clauses introduced by *ut*, is especially common in these relative clauses, occurring some 18 times.¹

Substantive Clauses of Result.²

Substantive clauses of result are a development of clauses of pure result. The origin of these is seen in a sentence like And. 916, *evenit ut veniret*, 'it so happened that he came.' But the result notion in such clauses soon became weakened and the substantive force became predominant, so that substantive clauses introduced by *ut* occur where not only no notion of result exists, but where it never could have existed, as e.g. Capt. 583, *est miserorum ut malevolentes sint*.

Examples:

a) *evenit* (13), e.g. Bacch. 1069, *evenit ut praeda onustus cederem*; M. G. 889; And. 916, *evenit ut veniret*; Phor. 66.

b) *contigit*: Amph. 187, *id contigit ut salvi poteremur domi*.

c) *fit* (14), e.g. Asin. 478, *id quidem fiet ut vapules*; Pers. 173, *potuisset fieri ut litteras sciret*; And. 386, (*fiet*) *ut excludar*; Lucil. 781; Trin. 429, *factum :: ut quidem illud perierit*.

d) *facio, committo* (13): Amph. 185, *facit ut quod se sit dignum sciat*; Curc. 258; And. 17, *faciuntne ut nil intellegant*; 55; 583; Trin. 704, *id me commissurum ut patiar fieri*.

Concerning these clauses with *facio*, Durham, p. 111, expresses the opinion that they are radically different from the clauses considered above, p. 224. In these examples, it will be noted that *facio* has the simple meaning 'to do,' and that the subjects of the main and dependent clauses are identical. The negative too in And. 17 (*ut nil*) seems to point to a non-volitive origin of the dependent clause in these sentences.

¹ Genuine potentials also sometimes occur in result clauses, e.g. Rud. 756, *tam sincerum ut quis dicat ampullarius*; And. 135, *ut cerneret*; H. T. 307, *ut scires*. These last two are 'could' potentials in a result clause. See p. 206 f.

² See Durham, Substantive Clauses (Cornell Studies, xiii), p. 109.

e) est (12), e.g. Poen. 1072, si itast ut sis Iahonis filius; Pseud. 1319; Phor. 270, si est culpam ut admiserit; 925, sin est ut velis; Hec. 99.

f) satin est (= nonne est): Bacch. 491, satin ut nescias.

g) convenit, 'it tallies': Capt. 649, convenit :: ut processerim; cf. Trin. 429, factum :: ut quidem illud perierit.

h) With nouns or pronouns, used as predicate or appositive (22), e.g. Merc. 513, nec mos meust ut praedicem; Men. 723; Merc. 629, de istac re argutus es, ut par pari respondeas; Trin. 637, an id est sapere ut qui beneficium repudies; Most. 789, antiquom optines hoc tuom, tardus ut sis; Pers. 46; Aul. 220; Hec. 243, meum ius ut cogam; 860.

i) With adjectives, etc. (6): Asin. 190, nec meum(st) ut mittam; Capt. 583, est miserorum ut invideant; Phor. 772, verissume. :: ut stultissime rem gesserimus; *ut gesserimus* is most naturally taken as depending on *verum est* to be supplied in thought from *verissume* (cf. Capt. 649; Trin. 429). Acc. 107; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 50, 7; Hec. 834.

j) With adverbs. In the two following examples the clause is apparently substantive and in apposition with the substantive idea involved in *eo* 'to this': Eun. 690, eo rediges ut nesciam; Phor. 201, eo meae fortunae redeunt ut distrahar.

k) Elliptical: Pseud. 1109, nec boni ingeni in is est, nisi ut improbis se artibus teneant.

l) In case of the following it is impossible to determine with any degree of certainty whether we have substantive clauses of result or substantive clauses developed from the volitive: Amph. 646, id modo si mercedis datur ut victor clueat; Merc. 1005, non utibilest hic locus ut arbitri sint; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem?

ADVERBIAL *QUIN*-CLAUSES.

We have already considered several types of clauses introduced by *quin*, viz. clauses developed from the deliberative; descriptive *quin*-clauses; relative clauses of result. Besides these, we have also certain purely adverbial *quin*-clauses. Thus:

1. We find a number of *quin*-clauses equivalent to 'without' and

a verbal noun; e.g. *Asin.* 675, *numquam orares quin darem*, 'you would never ask without my giving.' Expressions of this kind are perhaps ultimately derived from descriptive *quin*-clauses. Thus, *M.G.* 741, *nullus tam in amici hospitium devorti potest, quin, ubi triduum continuom fuerit, odiosus siet*, is probably a descriptive clause; 'no one who doesn't become a bore.' But there has developed also the force 'without becoming a bore.' So in many other cases. When this force had become common in sentences of the type cited, it naturally was extended to a wider range, and we find *quin* freely used with the force of 'without,' 'but that,' 'but what,' in combinations where *quin* could not have been originally a relative. In this way a new syntactical construction arose, and *quin* passed from a relative pronoun to a subordinate conjunction.

EXAMPLES: *Amph.* 308, *non feret quin vapulet*; 887, *neque me perpetiar probri falso insimulatam quin ego illum aut deseram aut satisfaciat*; *Asin.* 421, *quoi numquam me licet praecipere quin centiens eadem imperem atque ogganiam*; *Asin.* 675; *Aul.* 132; 474; *Cure.* 175; 209; *Most.* 147; 329; *Pseud.* 854; *Rud.* 228; *Stich.* 187; 754; *Trin.* 534; *Truc.* 142; 534; 907; *H. T.* 67, *numquam egredior quin conspicer*; 1006; *Eun.* 791, *numquam accedo quin abs te abeam doctior*; 841; 1092; *Phor.* 714; 825; *Hec.* 397, *si id fieri non potest quin sentiant*; 768; *Enn. Trag.* 245; *Acc.* 330; *Cato* (*Jord.*), p. 10, 1; *Afran.* 170; *Cornelia, Peter*, p. 222, 26.

2. By a further extension of the category just considered, we get a few instances of *quin*-clauses in which *quin* is logically a coördinate conjunction. I refer to sentences like *Naev. Trag.* 13, *numquam hodie effugies quin mea moriaris manu*. Originally this undoubtedly was, 'you shall never escape without dying by my hand.' But this is logically absurd. If the person threatened died, he obviously could not escape. The poet has simply used a conventional form of speech, but in a new meaning, the psychology of which is perfectly natural and clear. In this way a new use of *quin* has arisen. Other examples of it are: *Amph.* 239, *nec recedit loco quin statim rem gerat*; *Asin.* 305, *nec dependes nec propendes—quin malus nequamque sis*; *Hec.* 64, *hortor ne quousquam misereat quin spolies*, 'not to pity any one but to plunder'; *Hec.* 150, *eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum mihi neque utile virginist; quin integram reddam*;

Men. 725. This usage, of course, is well known in the Silver Latinity.

3. The two following seem to be an extension of relative clauses of result; Ad. 855, *numquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad vitam fuit quin res aliquid adportet novi*; 257, *numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam, id virtus quin superet tua*.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUOM*.¹

As a rule in Early Latin, *quom* in all its meanings, temporal, causal, and adversative, is construed with the indicative. Of the exceptions most are the result of attraction (some 50 instances), or are cases of the indefinite 2d singular (27 instances). Apart from these, there are the following examples:

1. *Quom* temporal: Asin. 395, *quom venisset, post non redit?* (Ussing, *conveni, sed*); Merc. 980, *quem quidem, in exsilium quom iret, redduxi*; where *iret* is questioned by Lübbert, and others have suggested *ibat*; Truc. 162, *haud istoc modo solita es me ante appellare, sed blande, quom illuc, quod apud vos nunc est, apud me habere*; where Lübbert would read *habebam*; Liv. And. 36 (Baehr), *quom socios nostros mandisset Ciclops*; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 55, *quom Hannibal Italiam lacesseret atque vexaret*; p. 64, 1, *quom essem in provincia legatus*; Pacuv. 166, *quom me aspicere dignarent* (taken by Koterba, *De sermone Pacuviano et Acciano*, p. 184, as causal); Eun. 22, *magistratus quom adesset, oceptast agi*; Afran. 105, *intempesta noctu, silices quom findat gelus*; 151, *quod praesidium mihi supponebas, quom me privares?* 232, *ita mater eius dixit, ambos quom emerem*; Enn. Ann. 18, *quom superum lumen nox teneret*; 327, *quomque caput caderet, carmen tuba sola peregit*; Lucil. 52, *quom vidissent*; 904, *columnam quom peteret*.

2. *Quom* causal: Epid. 111, *istoc probior es, quom in amore temperes*; where Brix suggests *temperas*; Men. 361, *mihi mira videntur te hic stare foris, fores quoi pateant, magis quam domus tua, quom haec tua sit*; M. G. 1287, *verum quom acceperim*; where Leo suggests *accepimus*; Eun. 861, *debeam, praesertim quom fa-*

¹ See especially Lübbert, *Die Syntax von Quom*, 1870; Hale, *The Cum-Constructions*, 1887, 1888, p. 45, ff. (*Cum-Konstruktionen*, p. 47 ff.), a trenchant and effective criticism of Lübbert's views; Dittmar, *Studien zur lat. Moduslehre*, p. 1 ff.

teatur; Hec. 529, demiror quid sit, praesertim quom recte pepererit; 704, iniussu non tollent meo, praesertim quom sit mi adiutrix socrus; Ad. 166, indignis quom sim acceptus modis; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 229, quom a servis eorum tam caste me habuerim, poteritis considerare; p. 234, quom ignoraret, rogavit; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, quom timerem, Iovem precatus sum.

3. *Quom adversative*: Pseud. 184, pantices madefactatis, quom ego sim siccus; Enn. Trag. 368, nilo minus ipsi lucet, quom illi accenderit; Ann. 119, quom nil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet; Lucil. 651, huc, alio quom iter haberet, venit; Naev. Com. 55, edepol, Cupido, quom tam pusillus sis, nimis multum vales; where Lübbert would read *tu tam pausillu's*; Phor. 733, quod ut facerem egestas me impulit, quom scirem infirmas nuptias hasce esse; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 19, 9, quom saucius multifariam ibi factus esset, tamen vulnus capiti nullum evenit.

4. *Quom = si adversative*; Capt. 892, dubium habebis etiam sancte quom iurem?

For descriptive *quom*-clauses, see p. 292.

The foregoing material shows that even in Early Latin the use of *quom* temporal, causal, and adversative had already established itself. As regards the origin of the usage, I accept the conclusions of Hale, *Cum-Constructions*.¹ Hale shows that the *quom*-clause is simply a form of the clause of characteristic (descriptive clause of fact). *Quom* is a form of the relative stem *quo-*, and, as such, was quite as capable of introducing a descriptive clause as was any other relative word. Just as *qui* took a descriptive clause stating a quality of a person or thing, so *quom* took a clause stating a quality of a time, i.e. giving the situation existing at the time. It was in this way that the use of *quom* temporal developed.

The causal and adversative uses grew out of the temporal use, purely as a result of the context. Cf. the similar use of English 'when,' e.g. 'When ('since') he saw ruin threatening him, he took his own life'; 'When ('though') he knew that this step meant ruin to all his hopes, he nevertheless decided to take it.'

¹ Dittmar's polemic against Hale (op. cit.) does not seem to me at all convincing.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *DUM* TEMPORAL, *DONEC*,
DONICUM.¹

1. *Dum*. The use of *dum*, 'until,' with the subjunctive goes back, I believe, to paratactic optatives in expressions like M. G. 1249, *opperiamur, dum exeat aliquis*, 'let us wait; may some one come out the while' (so Schmalz, *Synt.*⁴, p. 556 f.); Poen. 929, *dum erus adveniat, opperiar*, 'may my master arrive the while; I'll wait'; Rud. 328, *opperiar erum dum veniat*; Truc. 715, *praesidebo dum faciat*; Eun. 534, *mane dum redeat*. *Dum* in these sentences was the same particle which we recognized in connection with the clause of proviso, originally the oblique case of a substantive meaning 'the while.' The bulk of all the subjunctive clauses introduced by *dum*, 'until,' belonging to Early Latin occur after verbs of awaiting, expecting, watching, etc., thus lending support to the hypothesis of origin here advanced. Examples:

a) With verbs of awaiting, expecting, etc.: Amph. 696, *mane dum edormiscat*; Asin. 935, *manere dum cenem*; Bacch. 48, *dum veniat opperibere*; Men. 883, *manendo dum se recipiat*; Poen. 785, *operam date dum videatis*; Pseud. 1234, *nunc ne exspectetis dum domum redeam*; Rud. 922, *non exspectare oportet dum erus se suscitet*; Trin. 170, *opservavit dum dormitarent canes*; Truc. 482, *ne exspectetis meas pugnas dum praedicem*; 843, *nam haud mansisti dum ego darem illam*; And. 977, *longum est exspectare dum exeat*; 980; H. T. 543, *quid exspectat? an dum hic abeat?* Eun. 534, *mane dum redeat*; Phor. 89, *hic solebamus eam opperiri dum inde iret domum*; 480; Ad. 672, *an sedere oportuit dum cognatus veniret?*

b) With other verbs: Bacch. 932, *lubet lamentari dum exeat*; Cure. 525, *minas x qui me procurem dum melius sit*; M. G. 868, *hunc subcustodem foras ablegavit, dum ab se huc transiret*; Pseud. 563, *haec facinora promittere, qui vos oblectem, hanc fabulam dum transigam*; Rud. 1189, *quid meliust quam ut abeam, saltem tantisper dum apscedat haec a me aegrimonia?* Trin. 757, *dum occasio ei*

¹Elste, *De dum particulae usu* Plantino, 1882; Boettger, *De dum particulae usu apud Terentium et in reliquiis trag. et com.*, 1887; Richardson, *De dum particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, 1886; Lange, *De sententiarum temporalium apud priscos scriptores Latinos syntaxi*, 1878; Schmalz, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, xi, p. 333 ff.; Lat. *Synt.*⁴, p. 556; Hale, *Anticipatory Subjunctive*, p. 68 ff.

rei reperiatur, interim ab amico mutuom argentum roges; Truc. 22, non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est amanti, dum id perdiscat; Lucil. 129, nec longius quicquam nobis quam gladium dum accomodet alter; Cato, Agr. 76, 4, aperito dum inspicias; 95, 1, agitato crebro, usque adeo dum fiat tam crassum quam mel; 107, 2, usque coquito dum dimidium excoquas; 156, 2, paulisper demittito ad modum dum quinque numeres; 160, incipe cantare usque dum coeant (bis). Most of these seem clear cases, though some of them are possibly capable of explanation by attraction or assimilation.

As a rule, only the present tense occurs in *dum*-clauses of this type. Schmalz (Archiv, xi, p. 338) denies the use of *dum*, 'until,' with the imperfect for Early Latin. The above material, however, shows five instances of this idiom.

2. With *donec*, *donecum*: Rud. 811, ni invitassitis donec nesciat; Cato, Agr. 54, 4, usque dato, donec arescat; uncertain: Com. Incert. Ribb. 74, usque donecum effligatur.

As in the case of the subjunctive introduced by *ante quam* and *prius quam*, so also in the case of subjunctive *dum*-clauses Hale refers the employment of the mood to an 'anticipatory' subjunctive; Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, p. 68 ff.; Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, § 507, 5. But this theory seems quite unnecessary, and, in view of the great uncertainty of the presence of an anticipatory at all in Latin, extremely problematic.

SUBJUNCTIVE BY ATTRACTION (ASSIMILATION).

The subjunctive is often employed apparently as the result of attraction or assimilation to another subjunctive or equivalent imperative. So too when a subordinate clause is so closely connected with an infinitive as to form an integral part of the same, the mood is frequently the subjunctive, and the name "subjunctive by attraction" is given to this use of the subjunctive also.

A. SUBJUNCTIVE ASSIMILATED OR ATTRACTED TO ANOTHER SUBJUNCTIVE.¹

In Amer. Jour. Phil. viii, p. 54, Hale says: "In complex sentences made up of a main sentence with subjunctive verb and one or more

¹ Tenney Frank, Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, Chicago, 1904; C. Thulin, De Coniunctivo Latino, Lund, 1899, pp. 79-200; F. Antoine, L'Attraction modale en Latin, Mélanges Boissier, p. 25 ff.

subordinate sentences, the modal feeling in the speaker's mind which expresses itself in the main sentence is, in the nature of things, very likely to continue in the speaker's mind in the subordinated sentence or sentences, either quite unchanged or but slightly shaded. If, for example, I say in Latin, 'Let him send whom he will,' *mittat quem velit*, the mood in *velit* is not a case of 'attraction' or 'assimilation' at all. *Velit* is as much a jussive as *mittat* is. The meaning is, 'Let him choose his man and send that man.' Again, "the frequent recurrence of such examples gives rise to the occasional use of a dependent subjunctive with only a formal likeness to the main subjunctive, and no true modal feeling."

I am unable to admit the soundness of this reasoning. To my mind Hale seems to do great violence to the interpretation of the passage above cited.¹ I do not believe it legitimate to read into *velit* the jussive force which Hale attributes to it. Much less can I admit the justice of Frank's statement (op. cit. p. 4) that Hale's interpretation of the mood of *velit* is beyond dispute, or that the modal feeling of the main verb is shared by the dependent subjunctive in sentences like the following (cited by Frank, p. 5): Bacch. 656, *furetur quod queat*; Hec. 196, *di vortant bene quod agas*; Bacch. 673, *occasio fuit ut quantum velles tantum sumeres*.

I am, therefore, inclined to believe that in the phenomenon under consideration we are to recognize a purely formal and mechanical attraction. At least I cannot recognize the validity of the evidence offered in support of the origin advocated by Hale and Frank.

In a very large number of instances traditionally regarded as illustrations of attraction, Frank recognizes 'anticipatory' subjunctives (p. 11 ff.). But the existence of an 'anticipatory' subjunctive in Latin rests on too slender a foundation, in my judgment, to warrant its recognition in this type of clause. Especially must one question the legitimacy of recognizing an 'anticipatory' subjunctive in clauses dependent upon another subjunctive until clear instances of an 'anticipatory' are found following a main clause in the indicative. The passages cited by Frank, p. 13, are not of this kind. Every present subjunctive naturally contains a future force; but so

¹ Cf. Dittmar's review of Frank, Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift, xxv, col. 919 ff. Dittmar, however, rejects emphatically the theory of a mechanical attraction.

does every future indicative. The theories of Hale and Frank give no satisfactory explanation of the employment of the subjunctive rather than the future indicative in the subordinate subjunctive clauses in the examples cited in great number by Frank, p. 16 ff. So far as I can see, only the theory of a mechanical attraction will account for the presence of the subjunctive in these clauses.

Classification of Subjunctives Attracted or Assimilated to Another Subjunctive.

The main classification is determined by the nature of the governing clause :

1. Dependent on a jussive or prohibitive (53).

a) With relatives (24), e.g. Bacch. 657, *furetur quod queat*; Capt. 548, *ne tu quod istic fabuletur inmittas*; M. G. 190; 731; 1230, *quod cupiam ne gravetur*; Most. 1100, *quod agas id agas*; Pseud. 237; Stich. 149, *neque me celassis quod scias*; Hec. 391; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, *reliqua quae sint, uti compareant*; *quae opus sint locato, locentur*; *quae supersint, uti veneant*; Plaut. Frag. 88, *quique liceat veneat*.

b) With *si, sin* (16): Amph. 819, *si pudoris egeas, sumas mutuom*; 961, *tristis sit, si sint tristes*; *hilaris sit, si gaudeant*; Asin. 763, *si pictura sit, vendat*; Aul. 591, *sin dormitet, ita dormitet*; M. G. 188; 293, *si te di ament, tollas*; Rud. 834, *abeas, si velis*; Trin. 370, *ne prohibeas, si det*; Truc. 233; 839; 855; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, *si quid desit, uti paretur*; 2, 7; 5, 1.

c) With *ubi* (5): Bacch. 653, *ubiquomque usus siet, expromat*; Pers. 70; Truc. 230, *ubi nil det, mittat domum*; 232; Cato, Agr. 3, 2, *ubi lecta siet, oleum fiat*.

d) With other particles: *dum* (2): Poen. 20, *neu ducat, dum in scaena siet*; Truc. 232, *dum habeat tum (Lamb. conj. dum) amet*; *quom*: Pers. 152, *ut adflect, quom memoret*; *quando*: Pseud. 307, *quando nil sit, amare desinat*; *quam*: Hec. 634, *dum ne redducam, turbent porro quam velint*; *ut*: Amph. 960, *eri ut sint, ipse item sit*; Bacch. 662, *utquomque res sit, ita animum habeat*.

2. Dependent on a deliberative (25).

a) With relatives (14): Amph. 434, *quid ego ni negem, qui egomet siem?* 694, *te ut deludam, qui nunc primum te advenisse dicas, modo qui hinc abieris*; Bacch. 197, *egon ut, quod attigisset, non impetra-*

tum redderem? M. G. 426; 497; 556; 1276; Poen. 860; Hec. 852; Enn. Trag. 148.

b) With *quom* (7): Bacch. 1192, egon quom haec accubet inspectem? And. 943, egon patiar quom possim? H. T. 413; Eun. 565; Hec. 341; Enn. Trag. 121; Titin. 81.

c) With *ubi* (4): Bacch. 1190, egon ubi filius corrumpatur meus, ibi potem? Epid. 588; Men. 559; Phor. 970.

3. Dependent on an optative subjunctive (14): Asin. 46, di tibi dent quaequomque optes; similarly Epid. 6; M. G. 1038; Pers. 483; Poen. 1055; Stich. 469; Trin. 715, bene quod agas eveniat; Phor. 552; Pseud. 936, tantum duint quantum exoptes; Poen. 746, suspendant se quam quod loquantur creduam.

4. Dependent on a potential (16).

a) With relatives (10): Amph. 905, quam tu impudicam esse arbitrare et praedices, cum ea sermonem nec habeas; Capt. 961, quod ego fatear, credin pudeat? Curc. 700, quoquo posset, mitteret; M. G. 614; 735; Poen. 92.

b) With *ubi* (4): Men. 603, intro abeam, ubi bene sit; Poen. 148; Eun. 1080, facile pellas, ubi velis.

c) With other particles: *quom*: Capt. 961, credin pudeat, quom autumes? Rud. 979; *dum*: Rud. 1261, dum censeret, praeda esset; *ad quo*: Afran. 248, iratus essem ad quo (= in quantum, Nonius) liceret.

5. Dependent on purpose clauses (84).

a) With relatives (23): Aul. 605, ut quae fierent fieret particeps; Cas. 867, qui exeat, eum ut ludibrio habeas; Cist. 85; Curc. 29, ne id quod ames sit probro; Eun. 1026, ut faciam quod iubeat; Hec. 545.

b) With *quom* (22): Amph. 128, ut ne quaerent quom viderent me; 983, ut ministres mihi, mihi quom sacrificem; Asin. 185, se ut quom videat, gaudeat; Aul. 278; Bacch. 908; Most. 249; Pers. 190; 191; And. 424; H. T. 854; Phor. 839; Cato, Agr. 73.

c) With *si* (24): Amph. 724, ut quod obrodat sit, si male esse occeperit; Cist. 593, ne in quaestione sit, si quid velim; Curc. 468; Merc. 231, neu discordarent, si essent; 913; Most. 922; Poen. 27; Pseud. 93; 900; Trin. 691; 755; And. 316; 728; Phor. 314; Ad. 171; 282; Enn. Ann. 194, 8. In all these cases, of course, it is

entirely possible that there is no attraction, but that the *si*-clause represents an original 'should'-'would' condition.

d) With *ubi* (5): M. G. 3, ut, ubi usus veniat, praestringat; 1122; Pers. 230, ne, ubi vorsicapillus fias, servias; Pseud. 580, ut, ubi quomque congrediari, vincam.

e) With *quando* (5); Bacch. 730, ut cognoscat quando legat; 768; Men. 1045; Poen. 552; Trin. 1144.

f) With *dum* (5): Curc. 664, ut dum vivat alat; M. G. 950; Phor. 770; 1030; Trag. Incert. 169.

g) With other particles (5): *quam primum*: Trin. 42, ut, quam primum possim, videam; *etsi*: Vid. xiii, ut piscetur, etsi sit tempestas; *ut*: Capt. 343, qui ita ut velis perferat; *priusquam*: Truc. 524, ne, prius quam capiat, nos exstinxit fames. *quia*: M. G. 7, ne lamentur quia se iam pridem feriatam gestitem.

6. Dependent on a substantive clause developed from the volitive or optative (93).

a) With relatives (43): Amph. 60, facere ut sit comoedia reges quo veniant; 630, sum diligens ut quae imperes compareant; Bacch. 1173, non metuo ne quid doleat quod ferias; Capt. 257, causa ut vos servem quos sim mercatus; Curc. 550, mandasti qui attulissem ne spernerem; Poen. 6, iubet ut sedeant qui venerint; Phor. 125, lex est ut orbae qui sint proximi nubant; Stat. 162; Cato, Agr. 141, 1.

b) With *si, nisi*, etc. (19): Bacch. 778, adiuro ut, ni amem atque cupiam, tua latera lacerentur; 1037; M. G. 1187; Rud. 1295; And. 687, orare, si ames, ut venias.

c) With *quom* (9): Amph. 542, volo, ut quom absim, me ames; Aul. 273; Epid. 356; Capt. 495; Stich. 65; H. T. 1017, metuis ne non, quom velis, convincas; Cato, Agr. 28, 1.

d) With *ubi* (6): Bacch. 43, ut, ubi emeritum sit, se revehat; 45; M. G. 1234, ne mutant ubi viderit; Eun. 394; CIL. i, 196, censuit utei figier ioubeatis ubi facilumed gnoscier potisit.

e) With *dum* (7): Bacch. 1047, Ephesi multo mavellem foret, dum salvos esset; Pers. 494; Poen. 884; Rud. 499, quaeso, dum vivas, uti habeas; Ad. 681.

f) With *quando*: Truc. 432, ut, quando otium sit, ad me revisas; Pseud. 663; M. G. Arg. I, 11.

g) With *quam* (3): Most. 966, vide ne amplius quam satis fuerit biberis; Eun. 74; Hec. 729.

h) With other particles (3): *etsi*: Capt. 856, faciam ut cupias etsi votem; *utquomque*: And. 735, ut subservias utquomque opus sit, vide; *prius quam*: Eun. 751, cave ne, prius quam accipias, amittas.

7. Dependent on *quin*-clauses (mostly substantive) (11).

a) With relatives (6): M. G. 369, numquam deterrebor quin viderim quod viderim; Poen. 881; Trin. 588; Phor. 272.

b) With *ubi*: M. G. 742, quin, ubi triduum fuerit, odiosus siet, verum ubi dies x sit; Aul. 613.

c) With *si*: Capt. 353, numquae causast quin, si non redeat, des; Phor. 825, quin, si hoc celetur, in metu; sin patefit (note the indicative), in probro sim.

d) With *quom*: M. G. 1342, nequeo quin fleam quom abeam.

8. Dependent on a descriptive clause of fact ('clause of characteristic') (14).

a) With relatives (10): Capt. 467, dies quoi minus procedat quicquid facere occeperit; Cas. 183, nec qua in plura sint quae velim; 565; Trin. 953.

b) With *ubi*: Rud. 119, qui praefestinet, ubi erus adsit, prae loqui; Hec. 608, qui, ubiquomque opus sit, possit.

c) With *quom*: Cas. 133, unde auscultare possis, quom ausculer.

9. Dependent on result clauses (21).

a) With relatives (7): Merc. 513, mos est ut praedicem quod credam; Most. 173.

b) With *quom* (6): Trin. 732, ut perpetiar quom habeam; Eun. 933, ut, quom cognorit, oderit; Phor. 822.

c) With *si* (4): Curc. 379, hunc morem ut pugnīs rem solvant si quis poscat; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem, si elocutus essem? Hec. 548.

d) With other particles: *ubi*: Phor. 154, ut extimescam, ubi in mentem veniat; *quam*: Rud. 1242, ut cum maiore dote abeat quam advenerit; *dum*: H. T. 951, ut, dum vivat, meminerit.

10. Dependent on a subjunctive protasis (13).

a) With relatives (9): Amph. 871, mea sit culpa, quod egomet contraxerim, si id Alcumenae expetat; Capt. 205, si sinat solutos quos emerit; Curc. 268; Pseud. 785.

b) With other particles: *quom* (2): Men. 454, nisi adsint quom eitentur; Truc. 234; *quando*: Merc. 406, si sequatur, quando incedat; *dum*: Bacch. 1194, si, dum vivas, tibi bene facias.

11. Dependent on indirect questions (16).

a) With relatives (12): Amph. 1016, quis fuerit quem propter corpus stupri compleverit; Trin. 210, falson an vero laudent quem velint; Vid. 57; H. T. 1040.

b) With *quom*: Merc. 344, neque, quom roget, quid loquar cogitatumst.

c) With *si*: Rud. 925, ut piger, si velim, siem; Merc. 941.

12. Dependent on a 'stipulative' subjunctive (see p. 263) (7): Amph. 225, convenit, victi utri sint, urbem uti dederent; Capt. 380; Rud. 1128, concredam; ac si nil sit, ut reddas; Poen. 855; And. 200; Epid. 500.

13. Dependent on a clause of proviso (4): Trin. 211, dum quod lubeat sciant; CIL, i, 196 (ter).

14. Dependent on a causal clause: Cist. 102, iratast quia non redierim postquam resciverim.

15. Dependent on an imperative or future indicative: Amph. 439, ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto Sosia; Asin. 29, dic, obsecro hercle, serio quod te rogem; CIL, xi, 4766, neque efferto quod louci siet; Pers. 16, dabunt di quae exoptes; Asin. 623, dabunt di quae velitis; Cato, Agr. 29, in segetem, ubi pabulum seras, invehito. In all these the main verb is equivalent to a volitive or optative subjunctive. Attraction to the subjunctive after an imperative is found in Umbrian also, e.g. pone esonome ferar, ere fertu poe . . ., 'when it is carried, let him carry it, who,' etc.

16. Miscellaneous: Asin. 122, moriri mavolet quam non reddat quod promiserit; Men. 229, maior quasi terram videas (indefinite 2d singular), quae fuerit tua; Trin. 549, sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas, quo cuncti qui aetatem egerint caste suam conveniant. Here the clause governing the attracted clause is a clause in implied indirect discourse.

As regards the conditions under which attraction takes place, Frank's study shows:

1. The attracted clause is preferably in the same time-sphere as the clause on which it depends.

2. Its favorite position is between the introductory conjunction (when such exists) and the verb of the governing clause.

3. Its verb rarely expresses precise modal and temporal force.

4. The clause as a whole is rather of the generalizing than of the determinative type.

5. It is more frequently a temporal than a relative clause.

6. It is connected with the predicate more frequently than with the subject or object of the sentence.

7. As a rule, it is an essential clause, and grammatically depends very closely upon the main body of the clause to which it is attracted.

These favoring conditions are met in only about 37 % of all the clauses dependent upon subjunctives. When these favoring conditions do not exist, the dependent clause stands in the indicative, unless the clause would regularly stand in the subjunctive for some other reason (purpose, result, *etc.*).

B. SUBJUNCTIVE BY ATTRACTION IN CLAUSES DEPENDENT ON AN INFINITIVE.¹

That the infinitive, even outside of the limits of indirect discourse, has the power of causing the employment of the subjunctive in dependent clauses which would otherwise take the indicative, is sufficiently familiar. The name 'subjunctive by attraction' is given to this usage precisely as when a subjunctive is attracted to another subjunctive.

The origin of the usage is not easy to account for satisfactorily. However, I am strongly persuaded that Frank has discovered the truth, when (*Amer. Jour. Phil.* xxv, p. 428 ff.) he holds that the 'attraction' of the mood after the infinitive began with those infinitives which were logically equivalent to subjunctives. Thus when Plautus, *Amph.* 705, says, *certa res hanc est obiurigare quae me noluerit salutare*, this is felt as equivalent to *certa res est ut hanc obiurigem*, *etc.*, and the subjunctive *noluerit* is in consequence used after *obiurigare*, just as it would have been after *obiurigem*. So Bacch. 58, *apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo*, where *te esse* is felt as the equivalent of *sis* or *ut sis*. A very large number (70 %) of all the

¹ Frank, *The Influence of the Infinitive upon Verbs Subordinated to it*, *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xxv, p. 428 ff.; Thulin, *De Coniunctivo Latino*, Lund. 1899, pp. 1-76.

instances of 'subjunctive by attraction' after infinitives in Early Latin occur after infinitives of this type, viz. infinitives equivalent to subjunctives. I give the material in full (61 instances).

1. With relatives (34): Asin. 24, video necesse esse eloqui quidquid roges; Aul. 129; 751, si facere quod lubeat licet; Capt. 363, volt te operam dare quod is velit; Cas. 570, qui advocatos advocet, rogitare oportet; 872; M. G. 182, iube transire huc quantum possit; 982; Pers. 273; 601; Poen. 966, pati servire domi quae fuerint liberae; Pseud. 460, decet innocentem qui sit superbum esse; 1150; Rud. 112; 272; 321; 117; 394; Stich. 69; 686; Trin. 1105, iubeto quae imperaverim curare; Truc. 225; 228; Plaut. Frag. 80, agere oportet quod agas; And. 219, quicquid peperisset decreverunt tollere; 464, quod peperisset iussit tolli; H. T. 165, non convenit qui ad laborem pepulerim nunc me ipsum fugere; Phor. 537; Hec. 244, ut te cogam quae imperem facere; 840; Cato, Agr. 135, 3; CIL, i, 196, 1, de Bacanalibus quei foederatei essent ita exdeicendum esse censuere; i, 5041, oppidum quod posedissent possidere iousit dum populus Romanus vellet; Stat. 183.

2. With quom (6): Bacch. 58, apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo; 76, quom adveniat, te volo me amplexari; Capt. 146, alienus quom tam aegre feras, quid me patrem par facere est? Phor. 202, istaec quom ita sint, tanto magis te advigilare aequomst; 928; Scaurus (Meyer), p. 242, est iniquom, quom inter alios vixerim, apud alios me rationem vitae reddere.

3. With si, ni, etc. (15): Amph. 69, sive qui ambissent palmam, sive quoi duint, sirempse legem iussit esse; 880; 986, qui minus liceat minitari populo ni decedat mihi? Bacch. 1045; Cas. 440; Men. 848, votas parcere ni abscedat; M. G. 1356; Stich. 563; H. T. 626, mihi te edicere, si parerem, nolle tolli; Cato, Agr. 3, 5, esse oportet si contriti sint; 151, 4; Frag. (Jord.) p. 64, 4; CIL, i, 197, 10, iubeto eum, si pariat (=pareat) condemnari; 196, 24, si ques essent qui fecissent, eis rem capitalem faciendam censuere; 6, (exdeicendum censuere) si ques essent qui deicerent.

4. With other particles (6): *quam*: Pseud. 439, qui gnatum suum esse probiorem quam ipse fuerit postulet; Trin. 175; *ubi*: Cato, Agr. 2, 5, (oportet) ubi ea cognita sint, curare ut perficiantur; 155, 2; *ut*: Trin. 306, utrum esse mavelit ut animus censeat an ita ut

cognati velint; CIL, i, 199, 4, ubi ea facta essent, Romam venire iusserunt.

We have seen that the main source of the construction is quite probably to be sought in the use of the infinitive as the equivalent of the subjunctive. A contributory cause, recognized by Frank, is to be found in those cases where the attracting infinitive itself depends upon a subjunctive (9 instances). Thus in Cist. 497, quodcumque optes tibi velim contingere, it is entirely natural that *optes* should be attracted by *velim*. Other similar passages are: Pers. 290, liceat quom servos sis, dicere; Poen. 681, videre vos vellem quom aurum darem; Hec. 532, ut puerum praeoptares perire ex quo fore amicitiam scires; Com. Incert. (Ribb. p. 137), artem ne pudeat proloqui quam factites; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, qui vendiderint eos pigeat vendidisse; 2, 1, possitne, quae reliqua sint, conficere; Lucil. 145, 4, ut perisse velis quem visere nolueris. Under the same head I should bring CIL, xi, 4766, eod die quod reidinae causa fiat sine dolo cedere licetod, where the imperative is equivalent to a jussive subjunctive.

It will be noted that in most of the foregoing passages the attracting subjunctive is in close proximity — much closer than the infinitive — to the attracted subjunctive.

The preceding 70 examples include all but 16 of the cases of 'attraction' after the infinitive. The remainder, I believe, are to be accounted for as influenced by the two preceding types. Examples: Amph. 39, debetis velle quae velimus; Capt. 986, mos est oblivisci neque novisse quous nihili sit faciunda gratia; Cas. 564, stultitia est ad forum procedere in eum diem quous quod amet in mundo siet; Men. 1004, facinus indignum, erum deripier qui liber venerit; Trin. 357; Phor. 79; 960, quod auditura sit indicare placabilius est; Hec. 73; 149, quam decrerim me non posse diutius habere eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum est; Acc. 193; 215; Ad. 341, quom amet aliam, non est utile hanc dari; H. T. 578, nostrumst intellegere utquomque opus sit; Phor. 502, quom occupatus esset, hoc esse obiectum malum! Ad. 39, instituere parare quod sit carius. In the last two examples the infinitive is exclamatory, the only instances in Early Latin of the exclamatory infinitive with attracted subjunctive.

Frank in his discussion does not mention Ad. 39; while in the

Phormio passage he suggests that the *quom*-clause may be an early instance of *quom* causal.

Of the historical infinitive with attracted subjunctive, no instance appears in Early Latin.

On the whole the subjunctive is less frequent than the indicative in dependence upon those infinitives with which the subjunctive is possible. For the instances in Early Latin, see Frank, p. 443 f. The subjunctive was never obligatory, and was used only where the subordinate clause was an integral part of the idea conveyed by the infinitive. Furthermore it is usually generalizing and unemphatic, rather than determinative and emphatic. If relative, it is usually attached to the object of the infinitive; see Frank, p. 444 f.

Some of the examples cited as illustrating our construction, Frank (l. c. p. 430) regards as specimens of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse, e.g. passages like M. G. 182, *iube transire huc quantum possit*. While there seems to be no doubt of the close relationship of such a sentence as this to indirect discourse, yet it seems to me safer to regard this and similar examples as furnishing the starting-point of indirect discourse, rather than as influenced by it. See below under "Subjunctive in Oratio Obliqua."

SUBJUNCTIVE IN ORATIO OBLIQUA.

In my discussion of the subjunctive by attraction (see above, p. 312), I explained the "subjunctive by attraction" after the infinitive as resulting from the equivalence of the infinitive to certain common types of dependent subjunctives. The subjunctive in oratio obliqua seems to be an extension of the "subjunctive by attraction."¹ Expressions like Capt. 362, *vult te operam dare quod velit*; M. G. 182, *iube transire huc quantum possit*; Bacch. 58, *apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo*; Men. 848, *votas parcere ni abscedat*; CIL, i, 197, 10, *iubeto eum, sei pariat (pareat), condemnari*, are frequent in Early Latin, and, I believe, are correctly explained as the result of assimilation. On the basis of such expressions as those just cited, it was an easy step to such as the following: Asin. 363, *interminatust nos*

¹ The suggestion of Schlicher (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxvi, p. 71 ff.) that the usage under discussion is an extension of the repudiating subjunctive as expressing the status of an idea foreign to the speaker, is vague and far from convincing.

futuros ulmeos ni hodie essent xx minae; Pseud. 777, interminatus est, si non munus misisset, eum perbitere; And. 694, adiuro numquam me deserturum, non si sciam; Cas. 670, deieravit occisurum eum quicum cubaret; Rud. 1336, deiera te daturum eodem die ubi sis potitus; M. G. 1414, iuro me nociturum nemini quod vapularim; Rud. 1378, si redegissem, iuratus dare; Bacch. 1028, ius iurandum dedi daturum id priusquam abiret; Aul. 470, credo mercedem pollicitos si fecisset; Most. 1084, pollicitus dare si vellem; Asin. 529, promittat te facturum divitem si moriatur mater; Cure. 490, promississe, si quisquam adsereret, redditum iri; 667, promisit, si asseruisset, reddere; 709, promistin, si assereret, te redditurum; Cas. 53, sperat, si sit data, fore; Turpil. 58, sperabam, quom aetas accesset, non fore.

Expressions like the foregoing seem to me to have furnished the beginnings of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse. They stand on the border-line between the subjunctive by attraction after the infinitive, on the one hand, and the regular subjunctive in subordinate clauses after *verba sentiendi et declarandi*, on the other. They are related to the subjunctive by attraction after the infinitive in that the governing verb is related in meaning to those verbs which are followed by an infinitive and an attracted subjunctive. Thus we have verbs of threatening, vowing, promising, hoping, after the analogy of verbs of ordering, forbidding, wishing, and the like. Another point of likeness is that these verbs look forward to the future, like those after which we have the infinitive and the attracted subjunctive. At the same time we have in the expressions last cited genuine examples of oratio obliqua.

In thorough conformity with the theory that the beginning of the usage under discussion is to be sought in such expressions as I have cited, is the fact that in Early Latin a very large proportion (40 out of 100) of all occurrences of subordinate clauses in indirect discourse is found in sentences in which the reference of the dependent infinitive is to the future. Thus: Pseud. 1118, leno ubi esset domi me aiebat arcessere; Lucil. 639, habeas in animo causam gravem fore quae me abducat; Trin. 695, te dictatorem censes fore, si acceperim; Truc. 90, censuit celare se posse, grvida si foret; Trin. 1086, credidi

aegre tibi, ubi audisses fore; Amph. 207; 209; Bacch. 700; Merc. 419; 83; Rud. 405; Cas. 323; etc.

Examples (classified according to the introductory word):

a) Introduced by a relative pronoun (31): Cist. 585, se aibat mulierem convenire quacum esset negotium; Curc. 488; Trin. 212; Bacch. 953; M. G. 1391; Phor. 246, quicquid eveniat id deputare in lucro; Bacch. 344, haud utrum velim licere intellego.

b) Introduced by a conditional particle (38): Amph. 675, me meum officium facere, si eam, arbitror; Merc. 83, dico iturum me, si velit; Rud. 405, si peterem daturus dixit; Trin. 891, dicas, si quid crediderim, perisse; Stich. 80; H. T. 608; Cas. 323; 698, negat ponere nisi sciat; Merc. 243, respondet, ni properem, ducturum; And. 647, nonne sat esse visum est, ni lactasses et produceres; Phor. 643, quantum? : : si quis daret (sc. contentum fore).

c) Introduced by *quom* (8): Asin. 442, aibat reddere quom redditum esset; Merc. 70, sese laboravisse quom pater diceret; M. G. 389, arguere me visus est quom mea soror osculata esset; Rud. 1124; And. 330; Ad. 34; Lucil. 546; Cato, Jord., p. 46, 1.

d) Introduced by *ubi* (3): Pseud. 597, (dixit) septumas esse aedis ubi ille habitet; Pseud. 1118; Trin. 1086.

e) Introduced by *postquam* (5): Merc. 61, se postquam excesserit non dedisse; 73; Most. 975.

f) Introduced by *ante quam* and *prius quam* (5): M. G. 885, multos vidi fugere prius quam haberent; Bacch. 1030; H. T. 479; 816; Hec. 146.

g) Introduced by *dum* (4): Truc. 440, ostendit se infidelem numquam dum vivat fore; Merc. 77; H. T. 148.

h) Other particles: Poen. 276, qui mage immortalis vos credam esse quam ego siem? Trin. 742, neque ut sit data te sistere autument; Asin. 913; Merc. 67, ut spectavisset, solitum (esse); Cas. 420, scin rus hinc esse longe quo ducat? Phor. 722, quantum voluerit datum esse; Epid. 415, facturum dixit rem esse divinam domi, quia salvos redierit; M. G. 1031, lamentari ait illam quia tis egeat; 1414, iuro me nociturum nemini quod vapularim; Most. 520, illum credidi expostulare quia percussisses fores; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 5, ecquis est qui aequom censeat poenas dare ob eam rem quod arguatur male facere voluisse?

For the list of verbs followed by oratio obliqua, see under the Infinitive.

Implied Indirect Discourse.

Under this head belong the following: Hec. 651, hunc videre optabamus diem quom ex te esset aliquis; Capt. 998, vidi saepe picta quae Acherunti fierent; Men. 144, tabulam pictam ubi aquila Catameitum raperet; Pseud. 624, argento haec dies praestitutast quoad referret; Trin. 549, sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas quo cuncti convenient; Eun. 1013, paenitebat ni indicares; Pseud. 1242, quas promisi si effecisset; Acc. 325, primores provocavit si esset quis qui secum vellet cernere.

Subjunctive in Principal Clauses in Oratio Obliqua.¹

Of this usage, which becomes common in late Latin, we have, I believe, an instance in Asin. 52, scio quod amet. The attempt of Blass (Rhein. Mus. 1882, p. 151 f.) to explain *quod amet* as depending on the previous *suscenseam* cannot be regarded as successful. Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 77, 1, dicam de istis Graecis suo loco quid Athenis exquisitum habeam et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere non perdiscere, is taken by Mayen, op. cit., p. 10, as another instance of the same construction, dependent upon the following *vincam*. But it is impossible to dissociate *vincam* from the succeeding *esse*. It seems simplest to adopt Jordan's conjecture *quor*.

SUBJUNCTIVE CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOD*, *QUIA*, *QUO*, ETC.²

The traditional explanation of the mood in these clauses represents them as a kind of indirect discourse. This view seems reasonably borne out by the following material in Early Latin.

1. **With *quod*.** Examples are scanty. I have noted only Asin. 47, cur miniter tibi propterea quod me non scientem feceris? 582, hospitem inclamavit quod nolisset; Merc. 573, pervorse facis. :: quodne amem? (Scaliger's conjecture for *ames* of the MSS); Trag. Incert. (Ribb.) 123, rite Thesprotum pudet Atrai quod ipse a Tantaloducat genus (Bothe *ductat*; Keil *ducit*); Afran. 165, retinebitur vir

¹ See Mayen, De particulis *quod*, *quia*, etc. pro acc. cum infin., 1889, p. 7 ff.

² Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Konjunktionem *quod* und *quia* im älteren Latein.

praegnatem quod non exigit; Stich. Arg. 1, senex castigat filias quod eae viros tam perseverent sustinere.

2. With *quia*: Cas. 677, tibi infesta est. :: quam ob rem? :: quia se des Olympioni; M. G. 387, laeta visa (sum) quia venisset; Rud. 537, iure optimo me † lavissee † arbitror. :: qui? :: quia (*qui* A) auderem tecum in navem ascendere; Pacuv. 369, insanam esse aiunt quia incerta sit; caecam esse iterant, quia nil cernat; brutam quia nequeat internoscere; Bacch. 735, me loquitur nec recte quia reddidi et quia non fraudaverim; M. G. 1035, me inelamato quia te volgẽm; 860, ex cruciabit me quia non dixerim; Cist. 101, iratast quia non redierim; Merc. 924, iratast quia scortum adduxerit; M. G. 696, quia nil abstulerit suscenset; And. 376, si suscenseat quia non det; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 13, 6, quia is locus montibus praestet, Praeneste oppido nomen dedit; Calp. Piso (Peter), 82, 9, Tarquinium, quia Tarquinio nomine esset, metuere (hist. infin.).

The *quia*-clause is at times the apodosis (in the potential subjunctive) of a conditional sentence with suppressed protasis, e.g. Capt. 705, cur es ausus mentiri? :: quia vera obessent illi; Most. 1107, quia nil illi quaesti siet; Pseud. 318, cur non? :: quia pol qua opera credam tibi, una opera alligem canem agnini lactibus; 338.

3. With *non quo*, *quam quo*, *non quod*, *non quia*, *quin*: H. T. 554, neque eo dico quo quicquam senserim; Eun. 96, non quo quemquam plus amem aut plus diligam, eo feci; Amph. 913, non quo crederem; Ad. 825, non quo dissimilis res sit; 270, adsentandi magis quam quo habeam; And. Alter Ex. 7, non idcirco quod nollem; Asin. 844, non eo quia cupiam; Trin. 341, non eo haec dico quin velim.

Non quo is usually explained as for *non eo quod* by attraction; cf. *neque eo quo* in H. T. 554.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF INDEFINITE SECOND SINGULAR IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

As a rule all subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular stand in the subjunctive. Exceptions occur, e.g. Capt. 89, nisi qui colaphos perpeti potes (Cam. *potis*); Men. 87, quem adservare recte voles, esca vinciri decet; 93, facile adservabis dum eo vincolo vincies;¹ Merc. 146, quom uti voles (following a subjunctive); True.

¹ But in 95 we have the subjunctive.

768, si stimulos pugnīs caedis, manibus plus dolet; Cato, Agr. 3, 3, si sustuleris et parata erunt; 157, 16, auribus si parum audies; 158, 1, si vis;¹ Asin. 242, si adfers, tum patent; Appius Claudius (Baehrens, Frag. 2), amicum quom vides, obliviscere miserias.

In Wölfflin's Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, ix, p. 19 f., Blase has denied that the subjunctive is regularly employed in subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular.² But barring Cato and a mere handful of examples, of which those above cited are the chief, if not all, the subjunctive is always used in clauses of this type in Early Latin. Probably the same is true also for the classical language, though I have not accurate data for this period.

The origin of the usage under discussion is obscure. Possibly it is to be sought in expressions like the following: Amph. 705, si obsequare, una resolvas plaga; Cas. 562, quom aspicias tristem, frugi censeas; Pseud. 137, quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas; Trin. 496, ubi mortuos sis, ita sis ut nomen cluet; 1052, quom repetas, inimicum amicum invenias beneficio tuo; Phor. 265, unum quom noris, omnis noris; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; etc. In these the subjunctive in the main clause is the weakened potential discussed at p. 200 f. In the dependent clause the subjunctive is naturally explained as due to attraction. Expressions of the type cited are proverbial in character, and must have been very frequent in daily use. It is possible that the regular use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular may be an extension of its employment in these proverbial expressions.

Examples:

a) In conditional sentences (35): Amph. 703, si velis advorsarier; 705; Aul. 380, si quid prodegeris, egere liceat nisi peperceris; Capt. 202, animo si bono utare, adiuvat; 222; Men. 103; Poen. 213, si forte occiperis; Trin. 347; And. 637; Phor. 688; Ad. 28; Cato, Agr. 37, 1, si cariosam terram tractes; 95, 2; Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 5; si exerceas; si non exerceas; si nihil exerceas.

b) With relative pronouns (24): M. G. 675, quod sumas; 947; Most. 73, quod cupide petas; 782, quicquid imponas vehunt; Pers.

¹ In Cato the indicative is the regular mood in these clauses; the subjunctive is rare. Frank (Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, p. 16, footnote) regards the de Agr. as addressed to a definite person, but that is inconsistent with the occasional occurrence of expressions like 95, 2, si in tecto coquas, exandescet.

² Similarly Hoffmann, Modus in Lateinischen Zeitsätze, p. 27 ff.

114, mane quod occeperis; H. T. 570, animum advortunt quae non censeas; Eun. 761; Phor. 758; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; Cato, Agr. 37, 3, palos quos in tecto posueris; 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

c) With *quom* (27): Bacch. 540, quom censeas esse amicos, reperiuntur falsi; Cas. 562, quom adspicias; Epid. 624, quom adspexeris; 718, quom mali messim metas; M. G. 820, quom stertas; 1150, quom escenderis; And. 856, quom videas; H. T. 806; Eun. 659; Phor. 265, unum quom noris, omnis noris; *quom noris* is the reading of A. Donat. read *cognoris*; Cato, Agr. 61, 1, quom ares, bene ares; Frag. (Jord.), 28, 8, ventus quom loquare buccam implet.

d) With *ubi* (21): Bacch. 63, ubi periculum facias, aculeata sunt; Cas. 370, ita fit, ubi quid tanto opere expetas; Cist. 25; Merc. 839; Pers. 435, ubi quid credideris; H. T. 1059, ubi cognoris; Eun. 813.

e) With *quando* (3): Aul. 506, quando veneris; Merc. 118, tres res agenda sunt, quando unam acceperis; Ad. 206.

f) With *quam* (4): Men. 95, quam magis extendas, tanto astringunt artius; Pseud. 1175, quam velis, pernix homost (P *quamvis*); Trin. 530; Aul. 236, quam ad probos propinquitate proxume te adiunxeris, tam optumumst.

g) With *prius quam* and *ante quam* (3): Truc. 51, prius quam dederis; Ad. 583, prius quam ad portam venias, apud lacum est pistrilla; Cato, capit. 143.

h) With *ut* and *quasi* (= *sicut*) (3): And. 65, ita ut facillume laudem invenias et amicos pares; Pseud. 578, omnes res perinde sunt ut agas; H. T. 1058.

i) With *dum* (3): Men. 90, dum praebeas; Pseud. 629, dum sternuas, res erit soluta; Acc. 395.

j) With other particles (4): Trin. 679, datur tametsi petas; Aul. 505, quoquo venias, plus plaustorum videas; And. Alt. Ex. 16, quocumque adplicaveris; Men. 228, maior (voluptas) quasi ('than if') adveniens terram videas quae fuerit tua.

SUBJUNCTIVE CLAUSES WITH *QUAM*, INCLUDING
ANTE QUAM, *POTIUS QUAM*, *PRIUS QUAM*.

Quam, Potius Quam.

Quam is a coördinate conjunction and as such is properly followed by the same construction after it as before it. Hence where a subjunctive precedes, it is only natural that one should follow. Thus:

1. Independent subjunctives.

a) Jussives: Asin. 797, tu labellum abstergeas potius quam savium faciat; Pseud. 237, praevortaris quam animo auscultes; Rud. 1042, fiat potius quam pugnem; Ad. 248, potius quam litis sequar meum mihi reddatur.

b) Optatives: Aul. 50, me adaxint ad suspendium potius quam serviam; Poen. 746, suspendant se quam creduam.

c) Potentials: Bacch. 488, plus viderem quam deceret; 1040, dem potius aurum quam illum corrumpi sinam; Hec. 424, aufugerim potius quam redeam; Ad. 108, sineres potius quam faceret.

2. Dependent subjunctives.

a) Purpose clauses: Cas. 254, ut detur potius quam des; Men. 332, ut te abducat potius quam adstes foris; And. 162, magis id adeo mihi ut incommodet quam ut obsequatur gnato.

b) Substantive clauses: Bacch. 103, operam dabo ut accipias potius quam eas; Bacch. 1047, Ephesi mavellem foret quam revenisset; Cas. 252, iam domuisti animum potius ut quod vir velit facias quam advorsere? Men. 725, non patiar quin vidua vivam quam perferam; Mere. 486, visne eam? : : qui (sc. volo eas) potius quam voles? Most. 706, exsequi certa rest ut abeam potius quam domi cubem; Poen. 1150, facias quam memores mavelim; Pseud. 209, taceas malo quam tacere dicas; H. T. 928, abeat potius malo quam ad inopiam redigat patrem.

c) Descriptive clauses: Trin. 1057, ego sum insipientior qui curem potius quam tutelam geram.

d) Result clauses: Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire potius quam esset nupta!

e) After infinitives. After the analogy of expressions like *taceas*

malo quam tacere dicas (Pseud. 209), it was natural to employ the subjunctive following *quam* after infinitives dependent on *malo*, as Asin. 121, *moriri sese mavolet quam non reddat*; 811, *emori me malim quam non indicem*; Aul. 12, *inopem optavit potius eum relinquere quam commonstraret*; 661, *emortuom me malim quam non dem*; Bacch. 512, *quam fiat propensior mendicum malim vincere*; Cas. 112, *me suspendio quam tu potior fias satiust mortuom*; And. 798, *optavit parere ditias potius quam honeste viveret*; Capt. 687, *potius me caput periculo, praeoptavisse quam is periret, ponere*; M. G. 1115, *te verba facere volo. : : qui (vis) potius quam tute adeas, tuam rem tute agas*; similarly Men. 1058, *certissimumst mepte potius fieri servom quam te emittam*; 831, *quid mihi meliust quam med adsimulem insanire*; Rud. 328, *quid mihi meliust quam opperiar erum*.

The foregoing 36 examples represent the bulk of the subjunctive *quam*-clauses (barring those with *ante quam* and *prius quam*) in Early Latin. In all of them the conditions were such as to call for a perfectly natural and legitimate use of the subjunctive. The frequency of *quam*, *potius quam*, in sentences of the types above enumerated naturally tended to bring about the employment of the subjunctive after *potius quam* and *quam* (in the sense of 'rather than') even in cases where its presence is not otherwise easily explicable. In other words, we have a purely formal extension. This explanation, I believe, applies to the following passages: Asin. 816, *suspendam potius me quam haec auferas*; M. G. 311, *mussitabo potius quam inteream*; Most. 816b; 846; 884; Poen. 922; Pseud. 554, *potius quam id non fiat, dabo*; Phor. 408, *potius quam litis secter, accipe*; Truc. 442; And. 396, *inveniet inopem potius quam sinat*; Eun. 174; 176; Ad. 498, *animam relinquam potius quam illas deseram*; Lucil. 208, *uxorem caedam potius quam castrem me*; Pseud. 367, *occidi potius quam cibum praehiberem*; H. T. 443; Stich. 449; H. T. 1010; Ad. 240; Cornelia, Peter, p. 222, 14, *uti nunc sunt, erunt potius quam res publica profigetur atque pereat*; Aul. 436, *quid diximus secus quam velles*. This last, of course, may be the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition ('than you would wish, if it were possible'); cf. Naev. Com. 33, *votis me multat meis, quod praeter quam mihi vellem audibam hoc eminus*.

With *Antequam* and *Priusquam*.¹

In the case of the *ante quam* and *prius quam*-clauses, we see the same forces at work as in case of the *potius quam*-clauses. *Quam* was originally just as much a coördinate conjunction in *ante quam* and *prius quam* as in *potius quam*, *satius quam*, etc. Hence it was naturally followed by the same mood after it as before it. Thus it occurs with:

a) Jussives: Cato, Agr. 117, *antequam nigrae fiant contundantur*; 143, 2, *focum purum, prius quam cubitum eat, habeat*, i.e. 'she's to clean her hearth before she's to go to bed'; Cap. 143.

b) Optatives: Rud. 494, *utinam te prius quam vidissem, perbiteres*; Enn. Trag. 170, *utinam mortem oppetam prius quam evenat*, i.e. 'I prefer death rather than the occurrence.'

c) Potentials: M. G. 690, *prius quam galli cantent (audias)*; Trin. 886, *concubium sit prius quam perveneris*; Ad. 397, *non prius olfecissem quam coeperet*? Ad. 525, *prius nox oppressisset quam reverti posset*.

d) Purpose clauses: Epid. 277, *ut praestines prius quam veniat*; Men. 845, *adducam qui tollant prius quam faciat*; Rud. 455; Truc. 523; Cato, Agr. 113, 1.

e) Substantive clauses: Aul. 154, *in rem hoc tuam est. : ut quidem emoriar prius quam ducam*; Merc. 1015, *dicamus censeo prius quam abeamus*, i.e. 'I urge speaking before leaving'; Enn. 751, *cave ne, prius quam hanc a me accipias, amittas*.

f) Protasis: And. 376, *si suscenseat prius quam perspexerit*.

g) Indefinite 2d singular, or by attraction after imperatives.

1) *ante quam*, Cato, Agr. 50, 2, *haec facito ante quam incipias*; 53, *seorsum condito ante quam ocinum des*; 113, 1, *sinito dies xv ante quam oblinas*.

2) *prius quam*, Cato. Agr. 47, *prius resicato quam ad arborem ponas*; 134, 1, (*Cereri sacrum face*) *prius quam hasce fruges condas*; 157, 3, *prius quam id imponas, lavato*; Merc. 601, *prius quam recipias anhelitum, eloquere*; Pseud. 241a, at (*revoca*) *prius quam abeat*; Rud. 626, *praetorquete prius collum quam pervenat*; Truc. 51, *prius quam unum dederis, centum quae poscat parat*; Ad. 583, *prius quam ad*

¹ See Hullihen, *Antequam and Priusquam*, 1903; Hale, *Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin*, 1894.

portam venias apud lacum est pistrilla; Enn. Trag. 239, inspice hoc facinus prius quam fiat; Cato, Agr. 53, prius quam semen maturum siet secato.

The first seven examples from Cato may be explained either as the result of attraction or as illustrations of the indefinite 2d singular, though Cato does not systematically use the subjunctive either after the imperative or in the case of the indefinite 2d singular; see p. 320, and cf. Agr. 134, 1, prius quam messim facies, oportet; 113, 1, hoc facito pridie quam vinum infundere voles.

For attraction after the imperative, see p. 311.

h) After the infinitive, as the result of attraction, or as a subordinate clause in oratio obliqua, Amph. 533, exire prius quam luceat volo; Bacch. 174, ne me sinas senem prius convenire quam sodalem viderim; 1030; Merc. 167; M. G. 886; 1095; Poen. 321; 1267, nolo ego istunc enicari prius quam te mi desponderit; Truc. 901, manus votat prius quam habeat quicquam credere; H. T. 478, si intellexerit prius proditum te tuam vitam quam amittas filium; 816, me istuc ex te prius audisse gaudeo quam argentum haberes; Hec. 145, narrat se ante quam eam uxorem duxisset domum sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

In all of the above passages the subjunctive is to be explained as in case of the *quam*-clauses with *potius* above considered, i.e. we have a regular and normal use of the mood. If it were necessary, one might easily go further and explain the subjunctive with *prius quam* as after the analogy of the subjunctive with *potius quam*, for *prius quam* is very frequently used in the sense of 'rather than' instead of in the strictly temporal sense.

The following three examples are the only ones remaining of *prius quam* with the subjunctive in Early Latin. They are all easily explained as following the analogy of the uses above enumerated: Amph. 240, animam omittunt prius quam loco demigrent; Aul. 336, ad ravim poseam prius quam quicquam detur; Merc. 559, prius conveniam quam redeam.

Hale (Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, p. 84 ff.; Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, § 507, 4) refers the subjunctive with *ante quam*, *potius quam*, *prius quam* to an 'anticipatory' origin; but the considerations I have set forth above make his explanation seem to

me less probable. An idea of expectation is, of course, often present in these clauses, but that is a necessary result of the meanings of the particles introducing them. The positive evidence in favor of the existence of an anticipatory subjunctive in Latin is too slight to warrant its recognition here.

SUBJUNCTIVE IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS.¹

The origin of the employment of the subjunctive in indirect questions in Latin is not easy to determine. Originally these questions stood in the indicative, and that mood is still common in Early Latin; see p. 120 ff.

Two factors may have contributed to the establishment of the subjunctive. The first of these is the deliberative subjunctive. No less than 200 out of the 1150 indirect questions in Early Latin are merely dependent deliberatives, e.g. *Amph.* 1056, *quid agam nescio*; *Bacch.* 745, *loquere quid scribam*; *Merc.* 247, *quid facerem cura cruciabar*; *M. G.* 1034, *scin quid facias*; *Pers.* 148, *praecipe quid fabuletur, ubi se natam praedicet*. The great frequency of this type may have ultimately led to the employment of the subjunctive also in indirect questions of fact, like *Cure.* 279, *auscultemus quid agat*; *Rud.* 628, *quid sit expedi*.

The second factor which may have contributed to the use of the subjunctive is the potential use. In the case of several verbs the transition from the notion of future contingency denoted by the potential subjunctive to the notion of actuality is simple and natural. This is particularly true of *malle*, *velle*, *decere*, *opus est*, *usus est*, *posse*, and occasionally of others. Thus in *Capt.* 270, *servosne esse mavelis, memora mihi*, 'would you prefer' passes almost inevitably into 'do you prefer,' i.e. 'whether you (actually) prefer.' So in the following: *Cas.* 280, *eloquere quid velis*; *Amph.* 201, *quo modo et verbis quibus deceat fabularier, volo meditarier*; *Men.* 384, *miror quid hoc sit negoti* (cf. *Asin.* 407, *quid hoc sit negoti*, practically in the sense of the indicative, along with the other similar examples of the same use cited in the same connection, p. 200 f.); *M. G.* 1097, *dixi quo pacto id fieri possit*; *Stich.* 57, *quaeramus quid usus sit*;

¹ Becker, *De syntaxi interrogationum obliquarum apud priscos scriptores Latinos*, in *Studemund's Studien*, i, 165 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* iii, p. 277 ff.

61, *meministis quod opus siet*; 573; And. 287, *nec clam te est quam inutiles sient*; 811, *quam sit facile, commonent*; Rud. 1329, *eloquere quantum postules*. In all these the potential notion is so slight that the idea of actuality easily develops. Precisely the same is true in English. When I say, 'Tell me what you would prefer,' I virtually mean, 'Tell me what you (do) prefer.' So very likely in Latin. Without any effort to gather complete material under this head, I have noted 75 instances of indirect questions of fact which may have developed from potentials. In addition to the instances above cited cf.: Amph. 172; Asin. 88; Bacch. 1133; Capt. 376; Cas. 287; 353; Cist. 57; Cure. 456; Merc. 7; Poen. 92; 574; 856; 1008; Pseud. 278; Rud. 991; And. 50; 234; 536; 537; Eun. 662; Hec. 465. Certain types are particularly common, e.g. expressions like *eloquere quid velis*; *scio quid velis*; *nescio quid velis*. The great frequency of these makes it an easy step to expressions like *scio quid sit*; *nescio quid sit*, from which the idiom would easily extend itself. Analogy, it should be noted, works quite as much under the influence of a single speech-form in very frequent use, as under the influence of a number of similar forms. This is just as true of syntax as of inflections. Hence it is not methodically extreme to suggest that the *nescio quid velis* type may have been largely responsible for the development of the potential question into the question of fact.

Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* iii, p. 278, recognizes the share of the deliberative in the origin of the indirect question, but sees no possibility of a potential origin for any of these questions.

Classification of Indirect Questions.

Indirect Questions are introduced by over twenty-five different particles. The broadest division is into word questions or pronominal questions on the one hand, and sentence questions on the other.

Both classes again fall into questions of fact (Delbrück's 'Ist'-Fragen) and dependent deliberatives (Delbrück's 'Soll'-Fragen, = our 'Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness'). The word questions (1025) are much commoner than the sentence questions (125); while the questions of fact (950) are much commoner than dependent deliberatives (200).

I shall classify the material accordingly under two general classes: Word (or Pronominal) Questions, and Sentence Questions. Under each I shall give illustrations of questions of fact and of dependent deliberatives.

I. WORD (OR PRONOMINAL) QUESTIONS.

These are introduced by various pronouns and particles:

1. Most frequently (over 600 instances) by *quis*, *quid*, *ecquis*,¹ *numquis*.²

a) Questions of fact (500): e.g. Amph. 270, observabo quam rem agat; Capt. 509, rogo Philocratem ecquis noverit; Poen. 97, neque scit quid siet; 558, meminisse quo modo dederis.

b) Dependent deliberatives (130): Amph. 1056, quid agam nescio; Bacch. 745, loquere quid scribam; Epid. 317, ei praemonstrabitur quo pacto fiat; Pers. 148, praecipe quid fabuletur; Pseud. 675, quo modo agerem, instituta habebam; Acc. 628, quid capias vide.

In a number of cases *quod* is used for *quid* in indirect questions, viz. Cist. 707, scit quod velit; Merc. 628, tibi in manu est quod credas; ego quod dicam mihi in manu est; M. G. 624, si quidem te quod faxis pudet; Poen. 547, narravi vobis quod opus sit; Rud. 1355, meus arbitratus est lingua quod iuret mea; Stich. 61, meministis quod opus sit; H. T. 108; 210; 221; Acc. 432; Cato, Agr. 89, consideres quod satis sit.

This employment of *quod* for *quid* is usually explained as a relic of the period when *quid* and *quod* were both used indiscriminately as relative and interrogative. Cf. Frank, *Semantics of Modal Construction*, *Classical Philology*, ii, p. 174, footnote, who cites Cato, Agr. 148, quid volet, faciet. Cf. also Aul. 348, quippe qui ubi quid surripias nil est.

2. Introduced by *ut* (82).

a) Questions of fact (60): Amph. 136, memorat legiones ut fugaverit; Trin. 657, scibam ut deceret; Eun. 438, scin ut urat; Hec. 784, audisti ut sit.

b) Dependent deliberatives (22): Aul. 550, ut te accusem meditar; Phor. 181, neque uti devitem scio; Cato, Agr. Cap. 168, luxum ut excantes.

¹ Bacch. 1084a; Most. 907; Rud. 125; Stich. 366; Eun. 519; Ad. 877.

² Poen. 1008.

3. Introduced by *quam* (49). These are all questions of fact. Examples: Amph. 354, nescio quam tu familiaris sis; And. 812, quam sit facile commonent; Phor. 161, exspecto quam mox veniat; Cato, Agr. 30, cogitato quam longa siet.

4. Introduced by *ubi* (42).

a) Questions of fact (40): Amph. 336, non ubi sim scio; Cist. 502, quaere ubi sit; H. T. 820, scin ubi sit? Ad. 527, rogabit ubi fuerim.

b) Dependent deliberatives: Cas. 875, neque ubi lateam scio.

5. Introduced by *quantus* (31). These are all questions of fact, Amph. 508, experior quanti facias uxorem; Pseud. 305, paenitet quanto fuerit usui; H. T. 747, haud scit quantum damnum adportet.

6. Introduced by *quo* (31).

a) Questions of fact (25): Bacch. 144, quo eveniat dis in manu est; Cist. 169, observavit quo deferat; And. 399, vide quo me inducas.

b) Dependent deliberatives (6): Cas. 875, neque quo fugiam scio; H. T. 946, ut quo se vortat nesciat.

7. Introduced by *qui* ('how,' 'why') (29).

a) Questions of fact (14): Men. 337, miror qui noverit; H. T. 362, demiror qui potueris.

b) Dependent deliberatives: Most. 715, repperi qui ducerem; Poen. 1208, qui sperem hauscio; Hec. 103, qui credam, dic.

8. Introduced by *quin* ('why not') (16). These are all questions of fact, Amph. 750, mirum quin te advorsus dicat; Pers. 433, mirum quin tibi ego crederem; Merc. 204; Most. 493; Trin. 495; 967.

9. Introduced by *unde* (22).

a) Questions of fact (15): Curc. 596, rogat unde habeam; 608, dixi unde pervenerit; Merc. 221; And. 750.

b) Dependent deliberatives (7): Cist. 671, neque unde auxilium expetam habeo; Most. 430, speculabor unde sarcinam imponam; Pseud. 106.

10. Introduced by *uter* (12).

a) Questions of fact (10): Rud. 752, contende uter sit verior; H. T. 326, utram malis vide; Hec. 465.

b) Dependent deliberatives (2): Trin. 227, neque cogitatumst utrum expetessam; Poen. 1242.

11. Introduced by *qualis* (12). These are all questions of fact, Bacch. 786, nosces illum qualis sit; Pseud. 275, scimus te qualis sis; And. 503; Eun. 758.

12. Introduced by *quot* (9). These are all questions of fact, Pers. 187, si scis quot habeas digitos; Ad. 555, scire quot mihi sint domini; Lucil. 688, quot fuerint.

13. Introduced by *cur* (*quor*) (4). These are all questions of fact, Capt. 1007, scio cur adsimules; Cas. 517, cur amem me castigare, id ponito ad compendium; Merc. 504; H. T. 1.

14. Introduced by *quam ob rem* (12). These are all questions of fact, Amph. 17, quam ob rem venerim dicam; H. T. 943, rogitato quam ob rem faciam; 944; Hec. 205.

15. Introduced by *quapropter*: Amph. 86, mirari quapropter curet; Pseud. 498.

16. Introduced by *quare*: Eun. 11, causam dicere quare sit.

17. Introduced by *quoia* (4): Merc. 200, rogitare quoia esset; 721; Rud. 478; Hec. 7b.

18. Introduced by *quoiatis* (3): Men. 341, rogitant quoiatis sit; Poen. 993; Acc. 625.

19. Introduced by *qua* (3).

a) Question of fact, Ad. 689, num prospexi qua fieret.

b) Dependent deliberatives, Rud. 812, donec qua abeat nesciat; 225.

20. Introduced by *quotumus*: Pseud. 962, quotumas aedis dixerit id incerto scio.

21. Introduced by *ad quo*: Afran. 278, scire ad quo (= in quantum, Nonius, 76, 8) te expediat loqui.

22. Indirect questions depending on *rogasne* or some similar word understood (15): Men. 299, ubi me novisti? :: ubi ego te noverim? Epid. 215, id qui animum advorterim? Trin. 1050; And. 191, hoc quod sit? Eun. 74; 523; 651; Phor. 122; 685; Hec. 716; Ad. 84; 374.

In the two following we have *-ne* as well as *quid*, Eun. 191, egone quid velim? Cas. 117, egone quid faciam?

These questions are usually questions of fact. Exceptions are Ad. 733, quid facias? Eun. 74; Hec. 716, which are dependent deliberatives. Cf. Eun. 837, where *rogas* is expressed.

23. Introduced by *quoad* ('how soon'): Phor. 462, percontatum ibo quoad se recipiat.

24. Introduced by *quorsum* (6): And. 176, verebar quorsum evaderet; 126; 264; Eun. 155; 305; Hec. 193.

25. Introduced by *si* (28). *Si* has secondarily developed an interrogative force in certain connections. The way in which this arose, may be seen in a sentence like Trin. 148, ausculto si quid dicas; originally: 'I am listening, in case you should say¹ anything;' hence, 'whether you say.' Examples:

exspecto (7): Trin. 98, exspecto si quid dicas; Asin. 528; Cas. 540; Poen. 12; 1392, exspectabam si qui eas adsereret; Eun. 594; Enn. Ann. 234.

opperior: Truc. 692, opperiar si veniat.

maneo: Cas. 542, si se arcessas manet.

miror: And. 175, mirabar si sic abiret; Phor. 490; cf. Amph. 621.

Other verbs: perscrutor, Aul. 620; persequor, Cist. 183; operando, Cist. 185; Trin. 119; quaero, Vid. 56; observo, Vid. 68; percontor, Merc. 623; venio, M. G. 1158; mitto, Stich. 151; adeo, Hec. 429; viso, Ad. 549; obtueor, Most. 838; manum porrigo, Pseud. 1148; commercor, Capt. 27; 100.

In a dissertation, *Ecqui fuerit si particulae in interrogando Latine usus*, and in *Revue de Philologie*, xxxii, p. 47 ff., Felix Gaffiot denies this interrogative use of *si* for Plautus, as he does in fact for all authors prior to Livy. The examples above cited, he interprets as purely conditional in character. But his attitude toward these clauses seems quite unnecessary, and even to involve unnatural interpretations.

II. SENTENCE QUESTIONS.

These may be either single or double. Delbrück (Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 279) expresses the conviction that in sentence questions we have only questions of fact. But such is not the case. One of his own examples, Pseud. 709, dic utrum Spemne an Salutem te salutem, is a dependent deliberative. There are many others, especially in double questions. Examples will be given below.

¹ For the origin of *si* with the present subjunctive in conditional sentences, see p. 272.

A. SINGLE QUESTIONS.

1. **Introduced by *-ne* (19):** Amph. 715, valuisse ne exquisivi; Capt. 917, percontabatur possentne; Most. 166, contempla satin me deceat; Trin. 70, rogitas tene obiurigen; Ad. 12, pernoscite furtumne existimetis; Cato, Agr. 1, 4; 2, 1.

2. **Introduced by *utrum* (4):** Hec. 618, tua refert nil, utrum illae fecerit; 326; Liv. And. 19, utrum virginem oraret; M. G. 515, where some read the indicative.

3. **Introduced by *an* (20):** M. G. 448, qui scio an¹ ista non sit; Poen. 557, itane temptas an sciamus; Pseud. 432, fors fuat an istaec dicta sint; Phor. 774, haud scio an mutet; 717, forsitan nos reiciat, originally, 'it may be a chance whether;' so also Eun. 197. In the last two passages Fleckeisen reads *fors fuat an*. Acc. 121, fortasse an sit quod vos hic non mertet metus; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 23, 8, haut scio an partim eorum fuerint.

4. **Introduced by *num* (3):** C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 234, rogavit num ferrent; Eun. 663, vise num sit; Pers. 77, visam num afuerit febris.

5. **Without introductory particle:** Stich. 33, vivant, valeant neque participant nos; Truc. 779, volo scire fateamini; H. T. 454, sit rogas? Ad. 619, rogito quid agat, iam partus adsiet.

Most of the foregoing examples are questions of fact. Liv. And. 19, utrum virginem oraret, is a dependent deliberative. The only other examples of the same kind among these single indirect questions are: Epid. 543, hauscio an congrediar; Most. 783, hauscio an conloquar.

B. DOUBLE QUESTIONS.

These assume a great variety of forms. While questions of fact are much commoner than dependent deliberatives, yet the latter occur with some frequency. They are indicated in the following lists by (del.). Examples:

1. **Type . . . *an* (16):** Men. 722, quid id ad me tu possis an sis abitura? Rud. 580, eluas tu an exungare ciccum non interdum;

¹ For a discussion of the question whether *an* in this and similar questions arises by ellipsis, see Morris, The Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence (Amer. Jour. Phil. ix, x); also below, p. 485 f.

Aul. 730, incertumst abeam an maneam, an adeam, an fugiam (del.); Curc. 463 (del.); Rud. 213 (del.); 1106; Stich. 311; Enn. Trag. 387.

2. **Type . . . *anne***: Amph. 173, nec aequom anne iniquom imperet cogitabit; Eun. 554, rogitando sanus sim anne insaniam.

3. **Type *-ne* . . . *an* (13)**: Pers. 33, haec dies summa est sitne libera an serviat (del.); Capt. 270; And. 209, nec certumst Pamphilumne adiutem an auscultem seni; 535; Ad. 4; 241; Men. 574; Trin. 102; 210; Enn. Ann. 143, 4.

4. **Type *-ne* . . . *anne* (4)**: Lucil. 472, suspendatne se anne (an in, *codd.*) gladium incumbat; Cas. 515; Hec. 122.

5. **Type *utrum* . . . *an* (6)**: M. G. 345, scire utrum viderim an illic faciat; Stich. 76, ratiocinor utrum laccessam an temptem (del.); Cist. 679; Men. 386; 887 (del.).

6. **Type *utrum* . . . *anne***: Bacch. 576, percontarier utrum aurum reddat anne eat.

7. **Type . . . *-an* . . . *-ne***: Stich. 203, perquirunt alienum aes cogat an pararit praedium uxorin sit reddenda dos.

8. **Type . . . *-ne***. Enn. Ann. 55, 8, certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent (del.).

9. **Type *utrum -ne* . . . *an* (5)**: Capt. 268, utrum strictimne adtonsurum dicam esse an per pectinem (del.); Trin. 306; Pseud. 709 (del.); Eun. 721; Bacch. 500.

10. **Type . . . *an non* (5)**: Merc. 592, redeat an non nescio; M. G. 1265; 1336; Lucil. 885; Aul. 431.

11. **Type *utrum* . . . *-ne* . . . *an non***: Most. 681, videndumst utrum eae velintne an non velint.

12. **Type *ne* . . . *necne* (8)**: Cas. 572, percontarier adsitne ei animus necne adsit; Epid. 322, sitne quid necne sit scire cupio; Bacch. 400; Capt. 283; 711, cogitato emitteresne necne; Pseud. 451.

13. **Type . . . *necne* (10)**: Epid. 461, non scio molestum necne sit; Merc. 457; M. G. 1051; Trin. 850; Cato, Agr. 108, 1.

14. **Type *-ne* . . . *an non* (5)**: Capt. 455, dubitavi emeremne an non emerem (del.); Merc. 452, qui scio venirene eam velit an non velit; Phor. 445, vise redieritne an non; Hec. 508; 558.

15. **Type *ne* . . . *ne***: Hec. 664, videte remissan opus sit, reductan domum.

Other Logical Types of Indirect Questions.

Most of the indirect questions embraced in the foregoing classification have been either questions of fact or dependent deliberatives. Only rarely do we find anything else. I have noted only Capt. 711, *cogitato qualem gratiam haberes, emitteresne necne*; And. 258, *quid facerem, si quis roget*; Rud. 379, *rogas quid faceret*. The first two of these are apodoses of contrary-to-fact conditions; the last is a subjunctive of unfulfilled past obligation ('what he ought to have done').

Future Time in Indirect Questions.

In some 68 instances of indirect questions of fact we find that the indirect question refers to time relatively future to that of the governing verb.¹ Examples: Epid. 320, *exspectando quo modo dicta eveniant*; Merc. 110, *timeo quid sit*; M. G. 299, *quid me fuat nescio*; Trin. 594; Poen. 1249; H. T. 188; Men. 704, *provisam quam mox redeat*; M. G. 304, *insidias dabo quam mox recipiat*; 793; Phor. 161, *exspecto quam mox veniat*; 606; Asin. 51, *quo evadat sum in metu*; Bacch. 144; Most. 132; 395; Poen. 172; Pseud. 1102; Truc. 549; Phor. 111; 608; Hec. 279, *nec qui eveniat scio*; Trin. 98, *exspecto si quid dicas*, along with the 28 other indirect questions introduced by *si*; Pers. 716, *qui scio an adseratur*; H. T. 999, *haud scio an ducat*; Phor. 774, *haud scio an mutet animum*; Enn. Trag. 387; Bacch. 575, *percontaris utrum aurum reddat anne eat*; Merc. 592, *redeat an non nescio*; Lucil. 885.

Sometimes we have a future from a past standpoint, e.g. Poen. 1392, *exspectabam si qui adsereret*; Enn. Ann. 234, *exspectans si mussaret*; And. 175, *mirabar si sic abiret*; Phor. 490, *mirabar si afferres*.

It will be noted that the future force of the dependent verb is assisted by the context in most of the examples cited. Thus the governing verb often necessarily involves the idea of futurity, e.g. *timeo, exspecto, proviso, metuo*. So also the employment of *mox*, and even the dependent verb itself, e.g. *evado, evenio, moriar, abeo, redeo*, etc. The future force of indirect questions with *si* is, of course, perfectly natural, as these by origin are simply 'should'-'would' conditions that have become indirect questions.

¹ Naturally *all* dependent deliberatives refer to the future.

Hale sees in some of the foregoing examples a survival of the Indo-European pure future use of the subjunctive; see his *Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin*, p. 34.

Futurity is also occasionally denoted by the periphrastic conjugation, e.g. *Bacch.* 722, *nescio quid acturus sim*; *Truec.* 338, *praedivinant quo die essuri sint*; *H. T.* 569, *metui quid futurum esset*; *Hec.* 614, *incertus sum quid facturus sim*; *M. G.* 1183; *Pers.* 296; *Poen.* 817; *Pseud.* 567; *Merc.* 572; *Epid.* 377, *scitis ut futura sint*; *Hec.* 567, *ut laturus sit non clam me est*; *Men.* 722, *quid id ad me tu possis an sis abitura*.

Prolepsis in Indirect Questions.

Prolepsis occurs repeatedly in indirect questions, e.g. *Amph.* 485, *hoc scitis quid siet*; 524, *ut scires rem ut gessissem*; 662; *Men.* 519, *rem ut sit gesta eloquar*; *Trin.* 698, *scio te ut animata sis*; *Hec.* 567; *Capt.* 376, *qui me quid agitem, omnem rem perferat*; *Cas.* 637, *time hoc quid sit*; *Epid.* 575, *hanc quae sit nescio*; *Men.* 881, *ne me indicetis qua platea aufugerim*; *M. G.* 925; *Poen.* 1121; *Pseud.* 1212; *Rud.* 1068; *Trin.* 960; *H. T.* 662; *Eun.* 374; 1035; *Hec.* 350; *Eun.* 566; *Curc.* 590; *Trin.* 873; *Acc.* 19; *Cato, Agr.* 116. The phenomenon is commonest in the case of word (or pronominal) questions, especially questions of fact introduced by *quis*. I have noted only one instance of prolepsis in dependent deliberatives, viz. *Stat.* 80, *quos neque ut adprendas neque uti dimittas scias*. Among sentence questions prolepsis is rare. I have noted only *Cato, Agr.* 108, 1, *vinum experiri duraturum sit necne*.

Words and Phrases Followed by the Subjunctive of Indirect Question.

The subjunctive of indirect question is used with the following verbs and phrases. Where no numeral follows, but a single instance has been noted.

accipio (2), *Trin.* 10; *admiror*, *H. T.* 827; *agitur*, *H. T.* 476; *ambiguom*, *Trin.* 594; *animadvorto*, *Cato, Agr.* 1, 2; *appello*, *Poen.* 992; *arbitror*, *Aul.* 607; *arbitratus*, *Rud.* 1355; *arbiter* (2), *M. G.* 158; *attendo* (2), *Phor.* 24; *audio* (7), *Poen.* 1404; *aucupo*, *M. G.* 995; *ausculto* (3), *Bacch.* 404; *calleo*, *H. T.* 548; *canto*, *Rud.* 478;

castigo, Cas. 517; cf. Pliny, Epp. iii, 5, 16, *repeto me correptum cur ambulare*; caveo, Cato, Agr. 5, 6; cedo (5), H. T. 662; *celebrescit*, Acc. 274; celo, Pers. 221; certo (2), Enn. Ann. 55, 8; certus, And. 209; *circumspecto*, Eun. 602; cogito (19), Amph. 173; *cognosco* (6), Cato, Agr. 157, 1; *commemoro* (3), Phor. 715; *commoneo*, And. 812; *comparo* (3), Pers. 325; Acc. 309 (here *comparo* = *aestimo*); *com-monstro* (2), Cure. 590; *confero*, Pseud. 278; *conicio* (2), Cas. 95; *confinco*, Phor. 130; *coniectura* (2), Poen. 91; *considero* (3), Cato, Agr. 89; *conspicio*, Trin. 636; *consulo* (8), Men. 700; *consulto*, M. G. 1097; *contemplor*, Most. 172; *contendo*, Rud. 752; *curo* (3), Rud. 1068; *cura* (4), Men. 761; *decerno*, Pacuv. 35; *declaro*, H. T. 284; *delico* (= *indico*), Acc. 1; *demiror* (5), H. T. 362; *depugno*, Trin. 305; *demonstro* (2), Aul. 716; *dico* (55), Pseud. 709; *disco*, H. T. 971; *disputo*, Most. 88; *do*, Lucil. 581; *dubito* (2), Capt. 455; *ecfor*, Pacuv. 292; *eloquor* (8), Merc. 504; *em*, And. 619; *enarro*, Ad. 365; *enodo* (2), Pacuv. 283; *erogito*, Capt. 952; *erro*, M. G. 793; *evado*, Eun. 517; *existimo*, Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1; *expedio* (3), Rud. 628; *experior* (18), Stich. 311; *explano*, Phor. 380; *explico*, Acc. 342; *ex-qui-ro* (5), Trin. 217; *exspecto* (7, apart from *exspecto si*; see above p. 331), Phor. 606; *fallo*, Epid. 239; *falsus*, Men. 755; *fateor* (2), Plaut. Frag. 41; *habeo*, 'know' (4), Cist. 671; *haereo*, Eun. 848; *ignarus*, Hec. 676; *impero*, And. 490; *incertus* (13), H. T. 188; *indico* (3), Pers. 590; *inspicio*, Cure. 427; *instituo*, Pseud. 675; *intellego* (7), M. G. 867; *interest* (2), And. 794; *interpretor*, Pacuv. 151; *interrogo* (3), Poen. 731; *interviso*, Stich. 456; *invenio* (10), Merc. 254; *investigo* (2), Aul. 714; *iudex*, Ad. 4; *lego*, Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 37, 4; *liquet*, Trin. 227; *loquor* (7), Merc. 892; *meditor* (5), Amph. 201; *memini* (5), Phor. 224; *memoro* (2), Capt. 270; *metuo* (4), Truc. 809; *metus* (4), Trin. 1003; *miror* (17), And. 750; *mirus* (5), Stich. 674; *moneo*, Ad. 429; *monstro* (2), Epid. 536; *narro* (10), Hec. 145; *nescio* (86), Merc. 457; *nosco* (19), Trin. 92; *nuntio*, Amph. 195; *obliviscor*, H. T. 849; *obnitor* (*obnoxius*, *al.*), Poen. 518; *observo* (14), Men. 789; *occulto*, Pers. 222; *ostendo* (6), H. T. 155; *paenitet* (7), Truc. 533; *participo*, Stich. 33; *percontor* (8), Bacch. 575; *perdoceo*, Poen. 195; *perdisco*, Truc. 23; *perfero*, Capt. 376; *periclitor*, Amph. 689; *periculum* (4), Hec. 766; *ratio* (4), Capt. 23; *pernosco* (4), Ad. 13; *perquiro* (2), Stich. 202; *perscrutor*, Aul. 620; *perspicio* (3), Stich. 604; *pertineo*,

Rud. 1106; pervestigo, Merc. 935; potestas, Trin. 822; praecipio, Pers. 148; praedico, Poen. 1245; praedivino, Truc. 338; praemonstro (2), Trin. 854; profero, Lucil. 511; proloquor (2), Capt. 5; prospicio (2), Ad. 690; proviso (3), Ad. 890; pudet, M. G. 624; puto, H. T. 485; quaero (20), H. T. 658; quaerito (3), Men. 575; ratiocinor (2), Stich. 76; ratus, Acc. 432; recordor, Men. 972; refert (7), Curc. 396; reperio, Hec. 288; renuntio, Hec. 508; reputo (3), Trin. 256; requiro, Most. Arg. 9; rescisco (4), And. 967; reviso (2), Eun. 923; rogito (22), Men. 115; rogo (25), Hec. 558; scio (220), Capt. 283; scisco (3), Pacuv. 214; sciscitor, Eun. 548; scribo, Enn. Trag. 173; sentio (5), Trin. 639; servo, Lucil. 715; specto (?), Cas. 871; speculor (2), Most. 430; spes, Merc. 363; summa, Pers. 33; suspicio, Merc. 213; tempto (4), M. G. 1336; teneo (4), Pseud. 217; timeo (12), And. 264; turbo, Epid. 312; vereor (3), And. 176; video (51), Most. 681; viso (12), Pers. 77.

We find indirect questions also with the following phrases: quid ad me (attinet), (3), Epid. 76; Men. 722; animum advorto (3), Trin. 842; animum attendo, And. 8; certiolem (certius) facio (4), Cas. 353; Men. 763a; certamen cernitur, Bacch. 399; specimen cernitur, Most. 132; clam (me) est (4), Hec. 261; facio indicium (3), Hec. 546; in manu est (3), Bacch. 144; insidias do (2), M. G. 304; subduco ratiunculam (2), Capt. 193; in mentem venit (3), Merc. 294; tanti facio, Merc. 7; nili facere, M. G. 168; parvi pendo (3), H. T. 715; flocci facio (2), Trin. 992; flocci aestimo, Plaut. Frag. Fab. Inc. 132; floccum interdo, Trin. 994; ciccum interdo, Rud. 580; dolum confingo, Capt. 36; consilium capio, Eun. 613; quid est, Lucil. 729; in memoria habeo, Poen. 1279; in pectore foveo, Bacch. 1076; pectus pungit aculeus, Trin. 1000; da pignus, Poen. 1242; fors fuat Pseud. 432; fortasse, Acc. 122; in te est, M. G. 1051; operam do, And. 307; causam dico, Eun. 11; quid adfers, Phor. 1025; in pauca verba confero, Asin. 88; praeceptis onero, Pseud. 764; viam do, Epid. 193.

Besides this the indirect question may depend upon the general force of the context, particularly in chapter headings, etc. e.g. Cato, Agr. caps. 31; 34; 47; 50, and often.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUOD*, 'ALTHOUGH.'

In a number of passages in Plautus and Terence we find the subjunctive with *quod*, 'although.' The origin of this use is obscure. The instances are the following: *Asin.* 757, *quod amicum nominet*; 758, *quod illa amica amatorem praedicet*; 761, *quod dicat allatam epistulam*; 796, *quod simulet*; *Aul.* 91, *quod quispiam ignem quae- rat, exstingui volo*; *Cas.* 127, *quod postules*; so *Rud.* 1150; *M. G.* 162, *quod dicat*; *And.* 395, *quod speres*; *H. T.* 671, *quod sperem*; *Eun.* 785, *sane quod tibi nunc vir videatur, nebulo est*; *Eun.* 1064, *quod dicas*; *Ad.* 162, *quod purges*.

ITERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

This use is not ordinarily recognized as occurring before Caesar, and it did not become prevalent till the period of Silver Latin; yet the following examples seem to belong under this head:¹ *Bacch.* 431, *ubi revenisses domum*; *Scipio*, p. 210 (Meyer), *ubi agros optime cultos atque villas expolitissimas vidisset, in his regionibus murum statuere avebat*; *Bacch.* 433, *quom librum legeres*; 433, *si unam peccavisses syllabam*; *Enn. Ann.* 189, *hostem qui feriet mihi erit Karthaginiensis, quisquis siet, cuiatis siet*, 194, 1, *quocum libenter mensam partit, magnam quom partem diei trivisset*.

As regards the origin of the usage, I follow Hale, who (*Cum-Constructions*, p. 237 ff.; *Cum-Konstruktionen*, p. 293 ff.) explains it as an extension of the narrative *cum*-clause.

Several French scholars, notably Bonnet (*Revue de Phil.* viii, p. 75 ff.), Lejay (*Revue Critique*, 1899, p. 272 f.), Gaffiot (*Revue de Phil.* xxvii, p. 164 ff.; xxxii, p. 59 ff.), deny the usage here recognized, and explain the subjunctive as causal.

SEQUENCE OF TENSES IN THE SUBJUNCTIVE.²

A. After the Indicative.

I. AFTER PRINCIPAL TENSES.

1. **After the present indicative.**³ Examples of the regular sequence are:

¹ Cf. Lindskog, *De enuntiatis condicionalibus*, p. 115; Dittmar, *Studien z. Lat. Moduslehre*, p. 147 ff.

² Wirtzfeld, *De consecutione temporum Plautina et Terentiana*, 1888.

³ The historical present is treated later.

Present subjunctive: Men. 840, imperat ut ego illic oculos exuram; Eun. 969, necesse est huic ut subveniam; Most. 203, vix comprimor quin involem illi; Pseud. 276, (voltis) ut male sit mihi; And. 269, hoc timet ne deseras se; Amph. 527, ne legio persentiscat, clam redeundum est mihi. After *novi*: M. G. 452, neque vos qui sitis homines, novi neque scio; And. 503.

Perfect subjunctive: Trin. 543, nemo exstat qui ibi sex menses vixerit; Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; Trin. 207, sciunt id quod in aurem rex reginae dixerit; And. 35, ut semper apud me iusta et clemens fuerit servitus scis; Eun. 81, vereor ne illud gravius tulerit; H. T. 554, neque eo nunc dico quo quicquam illum senserim. With *novi* and *memini*: Aul. 777, si me novisti minus genere quo sim natus; Phor. 224, meministi olim ut fuerit vostra oratio? *

A few exceptions to the prevailing usage are found: Merc. 633, quid faceres, men rogas? Rud. 379, rogas quid faceres? And. 963, nemost quem mallet omnium; Eun. 561, nemost quem ego nunciam magis cuperem videre quam te. Here the dependent subjunctive naturally takes the same tense as in the independent usage from which the dependent use is derived. Less clear are Trin. 992, di me perdant si te flocci facio an periisses prius; Phor. 382, proinde expiscare quasi non nosses; 388, quasi non nosses, temptatum advenis; Rud. 218, quam minus servio quam si serva forem nata. With *mirum quin*: Most. 493, mirum quin vigilantia diceret; Pers. 433, mirum quin tibi ego crederem; Trin. 967, mirum quin ab avo eius acciperem. With *mirum quin*, it has been suggested that possibly *erat* is to be supplied.

2. After the future and future perfect indicative.

Present: Aul. 802, ibo intro ut quid huius verum sit sciam; Cure. 45, minus formidabo ne excidat; And. 313, impetrabo ut aliquot nuptiis prodatur dies; Men. 270, caverò ne tu delinquas neve ego irascar tibi; H. T. 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero.

Perfect: Epid. 371, parabo aliquam dolosam fidicinam, nummo conducta quae sit.

3. After the present perfect indicative.

Present: e.g. Amph. 177, qui hodie fuerim liber, eum nunc potivit pater servitutis; 869; Asin. 36, modo pol' percepi quid istuc sit loci;

Bacch. 370; Capt. 493, qui concilium iniere quo nos victu et vita prohibeant; Curc. 371; Epid. 285, repperi haec te qui abscedat suspicio; 354; 442; Men. 788; Merc. 344; 669; M. G. 1269, induxi in animum ne oderim; 1056; 1097; Pers. 81; 325; 621; Poen. 547; 774; Rud. 611; Truc. 776; And. 892, adducti qui illam hinc civem dicant; Eun. 286; 544; Phor. 522, repperi qui det neque lacrumet; 602; 647; 889; Ad. 54, ea ne me celet, consuefecit filium; 477; 653

Perfect: Curc. 608, dixi tibi unde ad me pervenerit; M. G. 867, modo intellexi quam rem mulier gesserit; H. T. 848, iamne oblitus es inter nos quid sit dictum? 1007; Eun. 420, quo pacto Rhodium tetigerim in convivio numquam tibi dixi? Phor. 577; Hec. 582; 607.

Exceptions. We have the following instances of the present perfect followed by secondary tenses: Cas. 680, huc missa sum tibi ut dicerem; Aul. 133, eo foras ted huc seduxi ut tuam rem tecum hic loquerer; Men. 784, quotiens edixi tibi ut caveres; Most. 715, hoc habet: repperi qui senem ducerem, quo dolo a me dolorem procul pellerem; where Wirtzfeld, op. cit. p. 23, takes *repperi* as an historical perfect. In Asin. 7, we have an ellipsis: quid processerim dicam; (processi) ut sciretis nomen huius fabulae.

II. AFTER HISTORICAL TENSES.

1. After the imperfect indicative. Examples:

Imperfect: Amph. 1096, aedes totae confulgebant tuae quasi essent aureae; Trin. 657, scibam ut esse me deceret; Bacch. 676, an nescibas quam eius modi homini raro tempus se daret? Eun. 155, at ego nescibam quorsum tu ires.

Pluperfect: Pseud. 912, nimis metuebam ne abisses.

By a kind of repraesentatio we find the present subjunctive after the imperfect indicative in Aul. 550, ut te accusem meditabar. The perfect: Enn. Ann. 55, 12, exspectabat populus atque ora tenebat, rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.

2. After the historical perfect. Examples:

Imperfect: Amph. 914, periclitatus sum animum tuum quid faceres et quo pacto id ferre induceres; Curc. 684, metui ne mi hodie apud praetorem solveret; Trin. 1142; And. 582, non nihil veritus sum ne faceres.

Pluperfect: Eun. 517, ubi friget, huc evasit quam pridem pater mihi et mater mortui essent; Ad. 368, mihi, qui id dedissem consilium, egit gratias.

Perfect. Occasionally we find the perfect subjunctive used as an historical tense after the historical perfect indicative: Amph. 431, factumst ut ebiberim; M. G. 262, non potuit quin participaverit; Pers. 583; H. T. 279, hic sciri potuit quo studio vitam exegerit; Hec. 2, intervenit calamitas ut neque spectari potuerit. Combined with the pluperfect: Amph. 745, audivi ut urbem expugnavisses regemque occideris.

By repraesentatio we often find the present subjunctive after the historical perfect, e.g. Amph. 115, adsimulavit se quasi Amphitruo siet; 195, me a portu pater praemisit ut haec nuntiem; Bacch. 533, postremo impetravi ut ne quid ei suscenseat; 589, me misit miles ad eam Cleomachus vel ut Philippos reddat aureos vel ut hinc eat; Cas. 55, armigerum adlegavit qui poscat; Cist. 168, opservavit quo deferat; 567, amplexa est genua plorans, opsecrans ne deserat se; 636; Men. 1057, praecucurristi ut quae fecisti infitias eas; M. G. 1238, istuc curavi ut opinione illius pulerior sis; Poen. 554, didicimus tecum una ut respondere possimus tibi; Trin. 15, dedi ei meam gnatam quicum una aetatem exigat; H. T. 527, quasi non ditiis abundet gnatus eius profugit inopia; Eun. 96; Hec. 683, huc animum ut adiungas tuum quam longum spatium dedi! Afran. 316, se obsequentem dixi praebeat; Capt. Arg. 7, ut amittatur fecit. Present and imperfect combined: Bacch. 352, feci ut auri quantum vellet sumeret, quantum lubeat ut reddat patri; 689, patrem exoravi : : nempe ergo hoc ut faceret? : : immo tibi ne noceat neu quid suscenseat; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, id egerunt ut vos potius meum casum doleatis quam ego vostro ingemiscerem.

3. After the pluperfect indicative: Men. 592, plus minus quam opus fuerat dicto dixeram ut eam sponsio controversiam finiret; Pseud. 549, rus ut irem iam heri constitueram; Stich. 652, Sticho mandaveram salutem ei ut nuntiaret.

4. After the historical present. — Here the present is somewhat more frequent than the imperfect, notably so in Plautus.

Present, e.g. Amph. 205, Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant suam; 240, animum omittunt priusquam loco demigrent; 1069, accurro, ut

sciscam quid velit; 1093, invocat deos ut sibi auxilium ferant; Capt. 509, rogo Philocratem equis hominum noverit; 511, orat obsecratque eum sibi videre ut liceat; Curc. 330, argenti rogo uti faciat copiam; 355, provocat me in aleam ut ludam; 361; 339; 340; M. G. 116, inscendo ut rem Naupactum ad erum nuntiem; Most. 1049, capio consilium ut senatum congerronum convocem; Rud. 605, ago cum illa ne quid noceat meis popularibus; And. 355, percurro ad forum ut dicam haec tibi; Eun. 578, edicit ne vir quisquam ad eam adeat; 519; Phor. 93, rogamus quid sit.

Imperfect, e.g. Amph. 214, respondent se et suos tutari posse, proinde uti exercitus deducerent; 225; Bacch. 290, quoniam sentio quae res gereretur; 301; Merc. 90, servom una mittit, quasi uti mihi foret custos; Phor. 592, venio ad hominem ut dicerem; H. T. 651, detraho et eum dico ut una cum puella exponeret; 492; Eun. 581, paucae quae circum illam essent manent; Ad. 868, dum studeo illis ut quam plurimum facerem; 365; Enn. Trag. 101, corpus contemplatur unde corporaret volnus; Ann. 194, 9, quocum multa volutat grandia clamque palamque, pudenter qui dicta loqui tacereve posset; Euhem. 515, postulat ut ipse regnaret; Pacuv. 331, imperat ut deducerem; Acc. 229, hortatur me ut meos manderem natos; Turp. 81, hortatur quam primum proficisceret; Pers. Arg. 3, emeret suadet.

Pluperfect: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 37, 3, deinde quae ego pro re publica fecissem leguntur.

The perfect is found in Stich. 366, dum percontor portitores ecquae navis venerit.

B. After the Subjunctive.

1. Present subjunctive. — The present subjunctive is regularly followed by the present and perfect, e.g. And. 687, orare iussit, si se ames, iam ut ad sese venias. This is true even when the present is used in the sense of the imperfect to denote a condition contrary to fact, as Aul. 523, compellarem illum ni metuam ne desinat. Examples of the perfect following the present subjunctive are: Bacch. 1012, nihil est illorum quin ego illi dixerim; Cato, Agr. 5, 2, consideret quae dominus imperaverit; 5, 3, quod dominus crediderit, exigat.

Exceptions: In And. 258, quid facerem, si quis me roget, the imperfect of a contrary-to-fact apodosis is naturally unchanged after the present. Old law in Gellius v, 19, ut tam filius siet quam si ex

eo natus esset; in Poen. 1251, si id fieri possit, ne indigna indignis darent, *possit* should perhaps be *posset*, which very likely was the reading of A. Recent editors read *possit*.

2. Imperfect subjunctive. — This is regularly followed by either the imperfect or pluperfect. Examples:

Imperfect: Asin. 674, si hoc meum esset, hodie numquam me orares quin darem; Bacch. 554, ni ita esset, tecum orarem ut ei quod posses mali facere faceres; Poen. 1066, viverent vellem; 681, videre vos vellem quom huic aurum darem; M. G. 731, qui lepide ingeniatus esset, vitam ei longinquam darent; qui improbi essent, is adimerent animam cito; And. 606, utinam mihi esset aliquid hic quo nunc me praecipitem darem; Eun. 91, utinam esset mihi pars aequa amoris tecum ac pariter fieret, ut hoc tibi doleret; Hec. 756.

Pluperfect: Amph. 524, ex me primo ut prima scires rem ut gessissem; Ad. 217, metuisti, si nunc de tuo iure concessisses paululum, adulescenti esses morigeratus, ne non tibi istuc faeneraret? Phor. 901, verebamini ne non id facerem quod recepissem semel?

Exceptions: By representation we sometimes find the present used after the imperfect subjunctive, e.g. Cas. 681, missa sum tibi ut dicerem ab ea uti caveas; Poen. 602, liberum ut commostraremus locum, ubi ames, potes, pergracere; Pseud. 3, si fieri possem certior, ere, quae miseriae te macerent (*macerant* P); 796; Rud. 129, qui adornaret ut rem divinam faciat; Eun. 933; Hec. 547, adeo me esse pervicacem, quoi mater siem, ut eo essem animo; Ad. 316, capite proum in terra statuerem, ut cerebro dispergat viam. Different is M. G. 963, egone ut ad te ab libertina esse auderem internuntius, qui ingenuis satis responsare nequeas!

The perfect is found after the imperfect subjunctive in Amph. 225, convēnit, victi utri sint, urbem uti dederent; And. 967, more hominum evenit ut quod sim nactus mali prius rescisceres. Here the use of the perfect is doubtless influenced by the present *convēnit* and the present perfect *evenit*. Other examples are: Asin. 443, nam retineri ut quod sit locatum eeficeret; 589, quoi rei? : : qui verberarem asinos si forte ocepserint clamare; H. T. 7, nunc qui scripserit et quoa Graeca sit, id dicerem.

3. After the perfect subjunctive. Examples of regular sequence are Cas. 304, metuo ne Olympionem mea uxor exoraverit ne Casinam

ducat; Capt. 395, dicito quo pacto convenerit . . . ut eum redimat et remittat.

4. After the pluperfect subjunctive, e.g. Ad. 396, non sex totis mensibus prius olfecissem quam ille quicquam coeperet?

C. After the Imperative.

Examples of regular sequence are: Asin. 740, patrem huc orato ut veniat; Capt. 395, dicito quo pacto convenerit; of irregular sequence: Phor. 380, explana mihi qui cognatum me sibi esse diceret.

D. After the Infinitive.

1. After the present infinitive.

a) The governing verb is in the present (not the historical present); the dependent tenses are the present and perfect, e.g. Asin. 149, ne id quidem me dignum esse existumat quem adeat; Eun. 1010, non possum satis narrare quos ludos praeberis intus. In Hec. 547, adeon me esse pervicacem censes, ut eo essem animo, si ex usu esset nostro hoc matrimonium, we naturally have the imperfect in the dependent condition contrary-to-fact. Stich. 253, quid igitur me volt? : : tritici modios decem rogare opinor te volt. : : mene ut ab se petam? : : immo ut tu aps te mutuom nobis dares, sometimes cited as an exception to the general principle, is hardly such. *Ut dares* depends logically upon *voluit rogare* to be supplied in thought. Similarly in Persa, 118, memini et scio et te me orare et mihi non esse quod darem, *esse* (dependent upon *memini* understood) really refers to the past and so takes secondary sequence; so H. T. 626.

b) The governing verb is in the future or perfect; the dependent subjunctive stands in the present or perfect, e.g. Amph. 1015, pergam exquirere quis fuerit; And. 196, si sensero hodie quicquam in his nuptiis fallaciae conari, quo fiant minus.

c) The governing verb is in the present perfect, followed by primary tenses, e.g. Amph. 64, me orare a vobis iussit ut conquistores eant per totam caveam; Bacch. 575, nunc me ire iussit ad eam et percontarier utrum aurum reddat anne eat secum; 1082; Capt. 267, ne id quidem, involuere inicere, voluit, vestem ut ne inquinet;

M. G. 971; H. T. 147. A secondary tense follows in *Amph.* 41, *quid ego memorem ut alios vidi commemorare quae bona vobis fecissent?*

d) The governing verb is in the imperfect; the dependent subjunctive is in the imperfect or pluperfect, e.g. *Pseud.* 492, *nolebam ex me morem progigni malum, erum ut suom servos crimineret apud erum;* *Phor.* 89, *hic solebamus fere plerumque eam opperiri, dum inde iret domum;* *Trin.* 212, *hunc aiebant Calliclem indignum civitate ac sese vivere, bonis qui hunc adulescentem evortisset suis.*

e) The governing verb is in the historical perfect, regularly followed by the imperfect or pluperfect, e.g. *Amph.* 880, *Mercurium iussi me continuo sequi, siquid vellem imperare;* *Eun.* 870. But several instances occur in which by *repraesentatio* we find the present or perfect: *Bacch.* 287, *occepi opservare eos quamnam rem gerant;* *Men.* 453; *Merc.* 419, *dixit se redhibere, si non placeat;* *Pseud.* 597, *miles dixit septimas esse a porta aedis, ubi illic habitat;* *And.* 687, *orare iussit ut venias;* *Phor.* 6, *qui nusquam scripsit cervam orare ut subveniat sibi;* *Hec.* 345, *intro iit videre quid agat.* Perfect: *Amph.* 1122, *dixit eum filium suom esse, qui illos angues vicerit;* *Poen.* 1056, *qui potuit fieri ut Carthagini gnatus sis?*

f) The governing verb is in the pluperfect: *Curc.* 425, *id te orare iusserat profecto ut faceres;* *Eun.* 699, *nec quis esset umquam audieram dicier.*

g) The governing verb is the historical present. Here, just as when the clause depends directly upon the historical present itself, we have sometimes the present, sometimes the imperfect, e.g. *Cist.* 183, *iubet illum persequi si qua queat reperire;* *Asin.* 343, *me inquit percontarier eequem filium Stratonis noverim;* *Hec.* 116; *Aul.* 318, *inquit postulare uti liceret;* *Rud.* 601, *videtur rogare scalas ut darem utendas;* *Trin.* 14, *quoniam ei, qui me aleret, nil video esse relicui;* *H. T.* 304.

h) The infinitive is independent.

Exclamatory infinitive: *Hec.* 532, *adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire.*

Historical infinitive: *Merc.* 240, *mihi videri mirum ut illaec capra uxoris simiaei dotem ambederit;* *Lucil.* 9, 4, *uni se studio omnes dedere verba dare ut caute possint;* 9, 7.

2. After the future infinitive.

a) The governing verb is in the present and we have primary sequence, e.g. Asin. 528, *an te id exspectare oportet, si quis promittat tibi te facturum divitem si moriatur mater sua?* M. G. 1414, *iuro me nociturum nemini quod ego hic hodie vapularim.*

b) The governing verb is in the present perfect, e.g. Hec. 586, *ego rus abituram hinc esse certo decrevi, ne mea praesentia obstet neu causa restet.*

c) The governing verb is past and we have secondary sequence, e.g. Asin. 363, *interminatust nos futuros ulmeos, ni hodie Argyripo viginti essent argenti minae:* Amph. fr. xi, *quid minitabas te facturum si istas pepulissem fores?*

But we sometimes have primary sequence, e.g. Bacch. 856, *dixin tibi ego illum te inventurum qualis sit?* Epid. 414, *te pro filio facturum dixit rem esse divinam domi, quia Thebis salvos redierit.* The future infinitive following the historical present may take either primary or secondary sequence, e.g. Amph. 205, *Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant suam: si sine vi et sine bello velint rapta tradere, si quae asportassent redderent, se exercitum reducturum, abituros agro Argivos.*

3. After the perfect infinitive.

a) The governing verb is present or future. Here the sequence is regularly determined by the equivalence of the infinitive, being primary if the infinitive is equivalent to a present perfect indicative, secondary if it is equivalent to a historical perfect.

Equivalent to a present perfect, e.g. Bacch. 864, *faxo se haud dicat nactam quem derideat;* Merc. 253, *capram illam suspicor iam me invenisse, quae sit aut quid voluerit;* And. 407, *orationem sperat invenisse se qui differat te.* Yet the imperfect occurs Eun. 931, *me repperisse quo modo adulescentulus meretricum ingenia posset noscere.*

Equivalent to a historical perfect: Epid. 508, *Stratippoem aiunt curavisse ut fieret libera;* Aul. 470, *credo illi mercedem gallo pollicitos coquos, si id palam fecisset;* And. 699. But at times even after a perfect infinitive equivalent to a historical perfect we find primary sequence, M. G. 1167, *(dicas) hinc senem abs te abisse, postquam feceris divortium;* Stich. 555, *videlicet parcum fuisse*

illum senem, qui id dixerit; 557; And. 664, nisi mihi deus satis scio fuisse iratos qui auscultaverim; Phor. 875.

b) The governing verb is past. Here the sequence is regularly secondary, e.g. Bacch. 342, censebam me eefugisse a vita maritima, ne navigarem tandem hoc aetatis; Merc. 67, atque extemplo inde, ut spectavisset peplum, rus rusum confestim exigi solitum a patre.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMPERATIVE.¹

The Latin forms designated as present and future imperatives are an Indo-European inheritance. The present was used to convey commands which the speaker meant to be executed forthwith; the future to convey commands whose execution was conceived of as beginning at a later time. Prohibitions were not expressed in Indo-European by the imperative, but by the injunctive with *mē*, as inferred from the state of affairs existing in Vedic Sanskrit. *Mā* with the imperative is not found until the classical Sanskrit. The Greek imperative with *μή*, therefore, and the Latin imperative with *nē* are not Indo-European inheritances, but innovations, though both appear in the earliest literature.

AFFIRMATIVE USES.

PRESENT.

Form.

Doubled forms are occasionally found, especially where the emotion is prominent, e.g. Amph. 765, mane, mane, obsecro; so Merc. 928; H. T. 613; 736; Ad. 264; Pseud. 1284, aperite, aperite; H. T. 349, redi, redi; Eun. 834, tace, tace, obsecro; Enn. Trag. 323, eloquere, eloquere; so *age*, *age* and *agite*, *agite*, which have become virtual interjections, e.g. And. 310, age, age; Turp. 207, age, age, egredere; Lucil. 585, agite, agite.

Plurals are sometimes accompanied by *aliquis* in partitive apposition, e.g. Men. 674, Erotium aliquis evocate; Merc. 131, aperite

¹ V. Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus bei Plautus; J. Stahl, De natura atque usu imperativi apud Terentium; Kühner, Ausführliche Gramm. der lat. Sprache, ii, p. 149 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, ii, p. 357 ff.; Blase, Historische Gramm. der lat. Sprache, iii, p. 234 ff.; Riemann, Revue de Phil. x, p. 161 ff.

aliquis; 910, aliquis huc foras exite; Pseud. 1284, me adesse aliquis nuntiate; Ad. 634, aperite aliquis.

The present imperative is also often accompanied by reinforcing or modifying expressions, as *amabo*, *obsecro*, *quaeso*, *sis*, *sodes*, *age*, *dum*, etc. Thus:

a) With *amabo*, very frequently in Plautus, in Terence but five times, e.g. As. 894, dice, amabo; Bacch. 100, propera, amabo; Men. 541, amabo, inauris da mihi; Merc. 503, amabo ecastor, eloquere; Most. 166, contempla, amabo; Stich. 752, date mi locum, amabo; Truc. 128, amabo, sine me ire; Eun. 130, hoc agite, amabo; 150, id, amabo, adiuta me; 534, fac, amabo; 663, vise, amabo; 838.

b) With *obsecro*, very common in both Plautus and Terence, e.g. Curc. 308, eloquere, obsecro hercle; eloquere, te obsecro; Bacch. 1026, da mihi cc nummos, te obsecro; Rud. 867, obsecro te, subveni mi; As. 29, dic, obsecro; And. 861, audi, obsecro; H. T. 403, retine me, obsecro; Eun. 421, narra, obsecro; 685, tace, obsecro.

c) With *quaeso*, very frequent, e.g. Amph. 500, imperce, quaeso; Bacch. 744, quaeso, cave; Capt. 570, quaeso hercle, agedum adspice ad me; Men. 498, responde, quaeso; Pseud. 547, da operam, quaeso; And. 8, quaeso, animum adtendite; H. T. 163, quaeso, tibi parce; 971, prius, quaeso, disce; Eun. 562, narra istuc, quaeso; Phor. 141; 350.

d) With *oro*. I have noted only Capt. 1021, sed tu dic, oro; Eun. 912, move te, oro.

e) With *sis*, very frequently, e.g. Amph. 585, sequere, sis; As. 677, cape hoc sis; Merc. 169, hoc sis vide; Most. 892, tace sis; Pers. 316, abi atque cave sis; H. T. 374, vide sis; Eun. 311, fac sis; 799, cave sis; Phor. 59, abi sis; Ad. 766.

f) *Sultis*, rare, not in Terence, e.g. As. 1, hoc agite, sultis; Stich. 220, adeste sultis.

g) With *sodes* (especially in Terence), e.g. Bacch. 837, dic sodes mihi; Men. 545, da sodes abs te; Pers. 318, emitte sodes; And. 85, dic sodes; H. T. 459, aliud lenius sodes vide; 770, dic sodes; Phor. 103, due nos sodes; 741, concede hinc paulum sodes; Hec. 358; 841; Ad. 517.

h) With *age*, *agite*, *agedum*, *age sis*, very frequent in the dramatists, e.g.:

1) *age*, *agite*: Amph. 551, age tu i secundum; 750, age me huc

aspice; As. 488, age ambula ergo; Pers. 38, age fi benignus, subveni; Ad. 937, age da veniam filio. *Age* may be used even with the plural, e.g. Cas. 488, age modo fabricamini; M. G. 928, age igitur intro abite; Rud. 808, age adsistite; Stich. 221, age licemini. Plural: Curc. 88, agite, bibite festivae fores; M. G. 1198, agite, abscedite.

2) *agedum*, e.g. Amph. 783, agedum solve eam cistulam; 1081, agedum expedi; As. 746, agedum istum ostende; M. G. 345, agedum ergo face; Eun. 694, agedum hoc mi expedi; H. T. 310.

3) *age sis*: As. 679, age sis hunc delude; Capt. 179, age sis roga emptum.

i) With *modo*: frequently, e.g. Amph. 674, sequere hac me modo; As. 145, me specta modo; Capt. 167, habe modo bonum animum; Curc. 655, sine modo; Men. 148, dic modo; Most. 326, cave modo; Eun. 65, sine modo; 724, id modo dic; Phor. 670, tu modo fac ut ducat; Ad. 280, tace modo; 538, fuge modo intro.

j) With *-dum*, frequently, e.g. As. 585, manedum; Men. 265, cedodum; M. G. 955, circumspicedum; Most. 674, pultadum; And. 29, adesdum; H. T. 249, abidum; Eun. 707, diedum; Hec. 803; 844, manedum; Pacuv. 202, iteradum. Separated: Men. 378, sine me dum.

k) With *quin*, frequently. The use of *quin* with the imperative seems to be borrowed from its employment in expressions like *quin abis?* used with imperative force, e.g. Most. 815, quin tu is intro atque otiose perspecta. Examples: Bacch. 276, quin audi; Curc. 240, quin tu perdura; Men. 416, quin tu tace modo; Pseud. 1016, quin sequere ergo intro; Rud. 628, quin tu omitte genua; And. 45, quin dic; H. T. 890, quin tu ausculta; Phor. 350, quin tu hoc age; 486, quin omitte me; Ad. 543, quin tu animo bono es.

l) With *proin*, *proinde*, e.g. Amph. 311, proin tu istam cenam largire; Stich. 667, proin tu lavare propera; As. 27, proinde istuc eloquere; And. 408, proin tu fac; Eun. 56, proin tu cogita; And. 707, proinde hinc vos amolimini.

m) With *sane* (infrequent), e.g. As. 464, at nosce sane; Pers. 500, cedo sane mihi; 772; H. T. 832.

Function.

Present for future. — While the present regularly and properly is used of acts which the speaker wishes to be performed at once, it

occurs occasionally referring to acts that belong clearly in the future, and under circumstances where the future is more correctly employed, e.g. Capt. 900, bene ambula et redambula; so M. G. 936; Most. 853. Here the act belongs to the future, and that tense is used in Capt. 452; Merc. 327; Pers. 50. Further, the present occurs at times where a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect clearly indicates that the sphere of the imperative is the future, e.g. As. 231, si alius ad me prius attulerit, tu vale; Bacch. 800, impinge pugnum, si muttiverit; Cas. 146, vir si quid volet, me facite accersatis; Cist. 592, vir tuos si veniet, iube domi opperirier; Ep. 423, ubi erit otium, revortere ad me extemplo; Men. 1105, id quod rogabo dicite; M. G. 1394, si non sequitur, rapite sublimen; Pers. 46, quicquid erit, recipe te ad me; 47; And. 848, ubi voles, arcesse; H. T. 618, illa si iam laverit, mihi nuntia. Expressions like Pers. 146, hoc si facturus, face, do not belong here, though cited by Loch, p. 5, as similar to those just mentioned. *Face* in the Persa passage refers to the immediate present.

In Indo-European the future imperative seems to have been used after the present to indicate that the execution of one command was to follow the execution of another, and the same usage was common in Latin (see below under the future, p. 355). Yet even when denoting a subsequent act, the second imperative frequently stands in the present, e.g. Asin. 367, abi et narra; Bacch. 592, abi et renuntia; Cas. 421, intro abi et fac accures; 587, i tu atque arcesse illam; 613, abi et aliud cura; so 718; Pers. 165; Cist. 770, da isti cistellam et intro abi; Men. 220, abi atque obsonium adfer; M. G. 255; 394; Most. 807, i intro atque inspice; 928; Poen. 1116; Pseud. 890, intro abi atque cenam coque; so Aul. 458; Stich. 533, abi intro et lava; Capt. 950, ite actutum, Tyndarum arcessite; Men. 736; 952; Pers. 487; Poen. 424; 1319; Pseud. 349; Stich. 683; Eun. 753, abi tu, cistellam effer; 763, abi atque obsera ostium; Phor. 563, abi domum et illam consolare; 309, abi, eum exquire atque huc adduce; so also Stat. 178, abi intro atque istaec aufer. Other examples where the future would naturally be expected are: Ad. 204, cras redi; Eun. 436, immo, auge suspicionem; 970, ego abeo: tu isti narra omne.

Logical force of the present imperative. In its range of meaning the

present imperative covers the entire field between peremptory commands and the humblest request or prayer. Thus:

a) Commands, e.g. Amph. 628, sequere me; 707, tace; 778, cedo mi; 984, concedite atque abscedite omnes, de via decedite; Capt. 950, Tyndarum huc arcessite; 954, age tu illuc procede; 964, tandem istaec aufer; Men. 696, heus tu, tibi dico, mane, redi; And. 28, istaec auferte: abite; 299, propera; 579, evocate Davom; 754, dic clare; 861, sublimen rape; 978, abi, propera, accerse; H. T. 762, accede huc; 831, cape hoc argentum ac defer; Eun. 505, ehem curate diligenter istam virginem; 506, vos me sequimini; 625, heus puere Pamphilam accerse.

b) Requests, e.g. Amph. 38, huc animum quae loquar advortite; 1146, nunc spectatores plaudite; As. 14, date benigne operam mihi; Cas. 280, eloquere quid velis; Cist. 787, more maiorum date plausum; Curc. 423, cape, signum nosce; Epid. 3, respice vero; Men. 678, pallam, amabo, mihi redde; M. G. 750, commodulum obsona; Most. 328, sine sine cadere me; Pers. 127, filiam utendam mihi da; 439, huc continuo adduce; Poen. 336, mitte amabo; 350, comperce amabo attrectare; Trin. 385, sed adde ad istam gratiam unum; Truc. 118, respice huc modo; And. 24, favete, adeste, rem cognoscite; 328, saltem aliquot dies profer; 596, gnatum corrigere enitere; 901, da veniam; sine exorem; H. T. 28, date copiam; 35, adeste, date potestatem; 339, obsecro aliquid reperi; 845, serva filium et me; Eun. 281, paululum da mi operae.

c) Advice, e.g. Amph. 277, perge, nox, ut ocepisti; gere patri morem meo; Poen. 309, abi domum ac te suspende (ironical); And. 383, dic te ducturum; 394, patri dic velle; 522, perge facere; H. T. 88, rastros adpone; 373, gemitus abstine; Eun. 609, muta vestem.

d) Warning, e.g. Most. 324, cave ne cadas; 460, fuge, obsecro, atque abscede; fuge huc, fuge ad me; Pseud. 1144, in hunc intende digitum: hic lenost; And. 205, cave; 300, verbum unum cave de nuptiis; 399; 753.

e) Encouragement, e.g. Amph. 545, bonum animum habe; 671, bono animo es; And. 350, nil periclist: me vide; 409, crede mihi; H. T. 241, respira.

f) Invitations, e.g. Most. 341, accuba.

g) Challenges, e.g. Epid. 699, da pignus; Pseud. 1070, roga me

xx minis; Truc. 275, pignus da ni ligneae sint; Cas. 301, machinare quidlibet quovis modo.

h) Entreaties, e.g. Amph. 765, mane mane, obsecro; Merc. 928, mane mane, Charine; And. 351, obsecro te, hoc me libera metu; Ad. 155, obsecro, populares, ferte auxilium: subvenite inopi.

i) Wishes, e.g. Curc. 455, leno, salve:: di te ament; and so frequently; Rud. 310, salvete; similarly vale; Capt. 900, bene ambula et redambula.

j) Prayers, e.g. Merc. 850, date, di, quaeso, conveniundi eius copiam; Capt. 976, serva, Iuppiter, me; And. 232, di date facilitatem pariundi; And. 473, Iuno Lucina, fer opem, serva me, obsecro; Eun. 1048, O Iuppiter, serva, obsecro, haec bona nobis.

k) Curses, e.g. Amph. 370, nunc vapula; so 395; Bacch. 579, recede hinc dierecte; Capt. 636, suspende te; Cas. 103, abi dierectus; Most. 8, abi dierecte; Poen. 160; Rud. 1170; Poen. 511, ite in malam crucem; And. 255, abi cito ac suspende te.

l) As protasis, e.g. Amph. 286, modo sis veni huc: invenies infortunium; Asin. 350, ausculta, scies; 723, exopta id quod vis: fiet; 876, sequere hac me modo; faxo ipsum hominem manifesto opprimas; Bacch. 1023, em specta! tum scies; M. G. 520, vise ad me intro; iam scies; Pseud. 49, recita modo; ex tabellis iam faxo scies; Rud. 386, i sane in Veneris fanum; sedentem flentemque opprimes; 1007, verbum etiam adde unum; iam in cerebro colaphos apstrudam tuo; 1010, tange! adfligam ad terram te; 1088, fac sis aurum ut videam! post ego faciam ut videas cistulam; Phor. 561, audacissime oneris quidvis impone; efferet.

m) With permissive force, e.g. Aul. 831, vel hercle enica; numquam hinc feres a me; Amph. 956, si quid opus est, impera; Asin. 107, tum tu igitur aliud cura quidlubet; Capt. 978, si quid me vis, impera; Cas. 248, immo age ut lubet; bibe, es, disperde rem; Cist. 771, tene tu cistellam tibi; Men. 425, impera quidvis modo; 690, patiar: tibi habe, aufer, utere vel etiam in oculos compingite; Merc. 907, opta ergo ob istunc nuntium quidvis; 182, quin tu si quid vis, roga; M. G. 676, est te unde hospitio accipiam; es, bibe, animo obsequere atque onera te hilaritudine; 773, utere, accipe; Most. 332, cedo manum.: : em! tene! 394, intus potate hau tantillo minus; 809, qualubet perambula; Pers. 145, quaeso hercle me

etiam vende, si lubet; Stich. 424, abi quo lubet; Trin. 276, adsum; impera quidvis; 384, tibi permitto; posce, duce; And. 546, accersi iube; 848, ubi voles, accerse; 897, quidvis oneris impone, impera. Note the frequency with which the permissive force is emphasized by the presence of *quidvis*, *si vis*, *lubet*, etc.

n) Denoting a stipulation, Asin. 231, atque ea lege, si alius attulerit, tu vale.

FUTURE IMPERATIVE.

Form.

As already stated, the future imperative in Indo-European referred to future time. The Latin has, in the main, adhered to the Indo-European use. Hence we find the future imperative, —

a) In conjunction with a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect.

1) Future, e.g. Asin. 165; 239, ut voles, ut tibi lubebit, nobis legem imponito; 372, quom imitabor Sauream, caveto ne suscenseas; 375, patitor tu, quom ego te referiam; Aul. 94, tum aquam aufugisse dicito, si quis petet; 340, si quid uti voles, domo abs te adferito; Bacch. 36, ubi me fugiet memoria, ibi tu facito ut subvenias; 83; 443; 729; Capt. 114, sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent; Cist. 108, si veniet, nolito acriter eum inclamare; Epid. 263, si placebit, utitor consilium; si non placebit, reperitote rectius; 595; Men. 430, auferto tecum, quando abibis; 529; 547; 727; 1029; Merc. 490; M. G. 866; 933, quom extemplo veniemus, mittitote; 1175; Most. 773; 1121; Pers. 728; Poen. 210; 1084; Pseud. 257; 480; 885; 858; 861; 862; 863; 864; Rud. 813, si appellabit quempiam, vos respondetote; 815; 1421; Stich. 67, si quis quaeret, inde vocatote; 148; 287; Truc. 879, ubi domi metues malum, fugito ad me; And. 863; H. T. 828, quod imperabit, facito; loquitor paucula; 865; 972, si displicebit vita, istoc utitor; Eun. 214; 503, si id non poterit, ad me adducito; 768, si vim faciet, in ius ducito; 1067; Phor. 1027; Hec. 76, si quaeret me, dicito; 769; Enn. Trag. 301, sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito; Titin. 23, qui non reddet, facito ut multetur malo; 169, si erit tibi cantandum, facito exvibrisses; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quom cogitabis, sic in animo habeto; 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto; 14, 4, quae opus erunt, indito; 18, 1; si voles, ad hunc modum vasa componito; 22, 1; 23, 2.

2) Future perfect, e.g. *Amph.* 501, quod erit natum tollito; 1097; *Asin.* 228, remeato audacter, mercedem si eris nactus; 371; 800; *Bacch.* 555, si non fecero, me esse dicito ignavissimum; 712; *Capt.* 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; *Cure.* 364, laudato, quando ecfecero; *Men.* 156, oculum ecfodito, si ullum verbum faxo; *M. G.* 21; 524, post, quando exierit, cito transeurrito; 160, quemque videritis hominem, huc deturbatote in viam; 565; 806; 927; 1176; *Most.* 361; *Pers.* 162, ubi argentum accepero, continuo illam adserito manu; 676; *Rud.* 755, postea aspicio meum, quando ego tuom inspexitavero; *Pseud.* 510; 513; 520; 1229; *Rud.* 815; 1347; *Stich.* 436; 719; 759; 770; *Eun.* 596; 853; 1056; *Phor.* 143; 718, ubi hoc egeris, transito; *Ad.* 582, ubi ad Dianae veneris, ito ad dextram; 816, quod hinc accesserit, id de lucro putato esse omne; *Cato, Agr.* 26, ubi erit lectum, oblinito; 30, pabulum aridum quod condideris, conservato.

3) Present with future force: *Men.* 1093, liber esto, si invenis.

b) In conjunction with a co-ordinate future or future perfect indicative, e.g. *Asin.* 240, modo tecum argentum adferito; facile patiar cetera; *Bacch.* 95, argentum iubebo ecferrī foras; tu facito obsonatum sit; *Men.* 538; *Merc.* 139; 497; *M. G.* 382, ego eloquar, sed amabo advortite animum; *Poen.* 346; 599; *Rud.* 1029; *Truc.* 726, eloquar, sed tu taceto; *Phor.* 229, prior adito tu; ego in insidiis ero.

c) Future following the present and denoting a subsequent act, e.g. *Amph.* 353, abi, advenisse familiares dicito. Here the idea is, 'go, and when you have arrived at your destination, tell, etc.' Similarly: *Amph.* 770, (i) tu, intus pateram proferto; *Asin.* 382, i, puere, pulta, atque Sauream evocato; 740, curre, patrem huc orato ut veniat; *Bacch.* 227, abi intro; ego hic curabo: tu intus dicito; 877; 1175, i hac mecum intro, atque ibi filium concastigato; *Cas.* 295; 756; *Epid.* 194, palliolum in collum conice itaque adsimulato quasi, etc.; *Men.* 436; 736; *Merc.* 277; 787, i, rogato meum patrem; *Most.* 578; *Pers.* 195; 444; *Pseud.* 20; 161; 647; 986; *Stich.* 150; 263; 477; *Trin.* 577; 803; 1103; *Truc.* 914; *Eun.* 595, cape flabellum, ventulum huic sic facito; *Phor.* 664; *Ad.* 351, abi et rem enarrato omnem ordine; 376, piscis ceteros purga; gongrum istum in aqua sinito ludere; *Enn. Trag.* 113, audi atque auditis hostimentum adiungito; *Titin.* 21, aspecta formam atque os contemplato meum;

172. As observed above (p. 351), this usage seems to have been Indo-European, being somewhat frequent in Sanskrit; cf. Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* ii, p. 359; Blase, *Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 236. But the subsequent act is often denoted by the present; see above, p. 351; Neue, *Formenlehre der lat. Spr.* iii, p. 220 ff.

d) Combined with adverbs or other time expressions referring to the future, e.g. *Asin.* 166, *semper tibi promissum habeto*; 685, *redito huc conticinio*; *Cas.* 210; *semper huic verbo vitato*; *Cure.* 30, *semper curato ne sis intestabilis*; 526, *cras peti iubeto*; *Men.* 437, *tum facito ante solem occasum ut venias*; 695, *aliam posthac invenito*; *Merc.* 375, *cras agito*; *perendie agito*; 1021; 770, *cras petito*; *M. G.* 1364, *cogitato identidem quam fidelis fuerim*; *Most.* 579, *redito huc circiter meridie*; 654, *petito cras*; *Pers.* 678, *rursum te ad me recipito*; *Poen.* 144, *postid mihi ignoscito*; 807, *cras mane in Comitio estote*; *Rud.* 858, *post huc redito atque agitato hic custodiam*; 1417, *hic hodie cenato*; *Trin.* 485, *semper tu hoc facito cogites*; *H. T.* 590, *at tu posthac comprimito manus*; *Ad.* 426, *iterum sic memento*.

e) In other cases the future imperative is shown by the context to involve a more or less definite reference to future time, e.g. *Amph.* 917, *vel hunc rogato Sosiam*; *Asin.* 91, *me defraudato*; 101, *tibi optionem sumito Leonidam*; 375, *aequo animo patitor*; *Aul.* 95, *cultrum securim fures venisse atque abstulisse dicito*; 257, *facito ut memineris*; so also, *Bacch.* 328; *Cure.* 210; *M. G.* 354; *Pseud.* 515; *Stich.* 47; *Capt.* 689, *facito ergo ut clueas*; *Cist.* 64, *facito ut scias*; *Poen.* 1414, *des facito aut reddas*; 1418, *facito habeas*; *Aul.* 458, *lege agito mecum*; *Bacch.* 75, *simulato me amare*; 84, *dato*; 703, *quantum lubet me poscitote aurum*; *Capt.* 190, *curato aegrotos domi*; 389, *salutem dicito matri et patri*; so *Cure.* 524; *Capt.* 395, *dicito patri*; so 401; 432, *cogitato hinc mea fide mitti*; 452, *bene ambulato*; so *Merc.* 327; *Pers.* 50; *Capt.* 721, *ergo ab eo petito gratiam istam*; 948, *ducito*; *Cas.* 273, *eum orato*; 309, *in furnum calidum condito atque ibi torreto me*; 493, *emito sepiolas*; 523, *facitodum merula quod cantat*; so also *Poen.* 408, *rem divinam facito*; *Rud.* 792; *Cas.* 832, *integrae atque imperitae huic impercito*; 870, *spectato hinc omnia*; *Cist.* 764, *ceterum ex ipsa exquaeritote*; *Cure.* 31, *quod amas amato testibus praesentibus*; 138, *tu me ne sitiam cu-*

rato; 622, intestatus vivito; Poen. 890, sed tu hoc tecum tacitum habeto; Epid. 730, liber esto; so also Men. 1029; 1148; Men. 548, haec me curaturum dicito; 628, properato apsepte me comesse prandium; Merc. 115, aspellito; 464, at me incusato; 908, deos orato; Most. 255, ubi tu comoda's, capillum commodum esse credito; 422, illi hoc dicito; 1150; Pers. 159, abs chorago (ornamenta) sumito; 246, tecum habeto. :: et tu hoc taceto; 302, paratum iam esse dicito, iubeto habere animum bonum; 667; Poen. 159, me dato; 181, rogato servos veneritne ad eum tuos; 406, atque audin? :: Veneri dicito multum salutem; 729, portam frangito; 872, nolito devellisse; Pseud. 123, de istac re in oculum utrumvis conquiescito; 545, stilis me totum usque ulmeis conscribito; 652, dato istunc sumbolum ergo illi; 1075, atque etiam habeto mulierem dono tibi; Rud. 1213, dicito daturum meam illi filiam uxorem; Stich. 553; Trin. 295, moribus vivito antiquis; 296; 323, benefacta benefactis pertegito; Truc. 429, sic facito; 953, noster esto, sed de vostro vivito; And. 865, cura adservandum, atque audin? quadrupedem constringito; H. T. 221, periculum ex aliis facito tibi quod ex usu siet; 702, ita ut res sese habet narrato; 783; 943; Eun. 445, par pro pari referto; 712; Phor. 664, petito hasce a me; Ad. 174, in istam partem potius peccato; 500; 574, praeterito hac recta platea; 575; 577; 940; 977; Acc. 373, ilico (= *in eo loco*) habitato; Afran. 230, ipsi me velle vestimenta dicito; Liv. And. Od. 20, ibi manens sedeto; Enn. Ann. 62, aeternum teritote diem concorditer ambo.

Future imperative accompanied by reinforcing expressions. These are much less frequent than with the present imperative. Thus:

a) With *amabo*: As. 939, memento, amabo; M. G. 382, amabo advortito animum.

b) With *obsecro*: Cist. 764, obsecro, exquaeritote; Ad. 281, obsecro te, istum hominem absolvitote.

c) With *quaeso*: Amph. 1097, quaeso, absolvito; As. 375, quaeso, patitor; Capt. 432, te quaeso, cogitato; M. G. 865, quaeso tamen accipito; Poen. 807, cras mane, quaeso, in Comitio estote; Ad. 808, quaeso, hoc facito tecum cogites.

d) With *sultis, sis*: Men. 350, adservatote haec sultis; Poen. 1084, facito sis reddas.

e) With *age*: Bacch. 855, age nunc vincito me; Phor. 1027, age

nunc Phormionem, qui volet, lacessito; Men. 866, agite, facitote sonitus appareat.

f) With *-dum*: Cas. 523, facitodum colas; H. T. 550, facitodum eadem memineris.

g) With *proin, proinde*: Eun. 106, proin tu, tacere si vis, vera dicito; Phor. 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas.

h) With *quin*: Eun. 902, quin tu me servato; Ad. 533, quin otiosus esto.

i) With *modo*: Amph. 520, muttito modo; As. 240, modo adfero; Men. 334, observato modo; Ad. 845, modo facito ut illam serves.

Except in the language of laws the 3d singular future imperative is rare. This may reflect Indo-European conditions, for in the Vedas the 3d singular imperative is likewise rare; see Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 360. Instances of the 3d singular are: Asin. 801, si dixerit, haec multa esto; Curc. 470; 472, damnosos maritos sub basilica quaerito; Men. 51, si quis quid curari sibi velit, audacter imperato et dicito; Most. 773; 1164, immo me praesente amato, bibito, facito quod lubet; Poen. 211; Pseud. 950; Phor. 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas; 1027, qui volet, lacessito. The only instance of the 3d plural is Poen. 1281, tum profecto me sibi habento scurrae ludificatui.

A solitary instance of an imperative in a relative clause occurs in H. T. 577, quod illum facere credito.

Function.

Future used referring to the present. In a few instances (mostly standing formulas) the future imperative is used without apparent reference to future time.¹ Thus *salveto* (not in Terence) often occurs (especially in reply to a previous *salve*; Havet, Wölfflin's Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, x, p. 287 ff.) as the equivalent of *salve*, e.g. Curc. 234, *salve* : : *salveto*; so Merc. 283; Rud. 416; As. 296; Pers. 789; Men. 1076, *tu salveto, tu vale*; Rud. 103, *pater salveto* : : *salvo' sis*. So often *facito*, e.g. Bacch. 1153, *facito ut facias*; Cist. 62; 64, *facito ut scias*; Men. 866, *agite, facitote sonitus unguularum appareat*; Merc. 565, *facito ut cogites*; so also Most. 216; Stich. 519; Ad. 500;

¹ So also in the Vedas. The usage may have been Indo-European; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 360.

M. G. 354, *facito ut memineris*; so also Pers. 500; Stich. 47; Pers. 388, *facito ut veniat in mentem tibi*. Similarly *cogitato* (= *cogita*), e.g. Capt. 711; M. G. 915; Eun. 759; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; and often. Loch, p. 10, suggests that this may be on prosodic grounds. Other examples are: Bacch. 992, *animum advortito igitur*; so Acc. 485; Amph. 507, *observatote quam blande palpabitur*; Men. 334, *observato modo*; Aul. 56; Bacch. 741, *plane adscribito*; cf. 745, *adscribedum*, which is not different from *adscribito*; M. G. 1029; 1034; 1217; Pers. 154; Poen. 1320, *si quid per iocum dixi, nolito in serium convertere*; Bacch. 75, *simulato me amare*; Aul. 788, "*ita di faxint*," *inquito*; Men. 51, *si quis quid curari sibi velit, audacter imperato et dicito*; Phor. 166, *depecisci morte cupio*; tu *conicito cetera*; 423, *omnia illum putato dicere*; Lucil. 582, *coicito te intro ac bono animo es*; Liv. And. Od. 6, *mihi narrato omnia*; C. Gracchus (Meyer, p. 229), *si ulla meretrix domum meam intravit, nequissimum me existimatote*; Enn. Trag. 355, *extemplo me necato et filiam*. This is the only instance I have noted where the future imperative is used accompanied by an adverb denoting the immediate present, unless the imperative is joined to a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect indicative; see above, p. 354 f.

The only imperative of *scire* is *scito*, with the force of the present, e.g. Eun. 877; Hec. 67; Cato, Agr. 1, 6; and frequently. M. G. 282 the MSS. read *scis*, for which Bentley, followed by Lindsay, reads *sci*; others read *scias*. Like *scito* is *memento*, e.g. Merc. 282, *hoc memento* and frequently. Doubled in Cas. 737, *memento, memento*.

Logical force of the future imperative. In its logical value the future imperative covers substantially the same field of meaning as the present. Thus it is used to convey, —

a) Commands, e.g. Amph. 501, *quod erit natum, tollito*; As. 375, *patitor, quom ego te referiam*; Aul. 94, *aquam aufugisse dicito*; Rud. 813, *si appellabit quempiam, vos respondetote*; Eun. 768, *si vim faciet, in ius ducito*; Enn. Trag. 301, *sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito*; Titin. 169.

b) Requests, e.g. As. 939, *de palla memento, amabo*; Capt. 432, *te, quaeso, cogitato mea fide mitti domum*; Men. 350, *adservatote haec sultis*; Poen. 144, *postid mihi ignoscito*; Liv. And. Od. 6, *tuque*

mihi omnia narrato; Ad. 281, obsecro te hercle, hominem istum quam primum absolvitote.

c) Advice, e.g. H. T. 972, si displicebit vita, istoc utitor; Eun. 445, par pro pari referto; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quom cogitabis, sic in animo habeto; 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto.

d) Probably the commonest single use of the future imperative is in laws and in general directions for procedure. This use is peculiar to the future and is not shared by the present. Examples: Leges Regiae, Festus, 189, dis piaculum dato; Gell. iv, 3, 3, si tangit, Iunoni agnum caedito; Livy, i, 26, si provocarit, provocatione certato; si vincent, caput obnubito, infelici arbori suspendito, verberato vel intra pomerium vel extra; XII Tab. 1, si in ius vocat, ito; 8, patronus si clienti fraudem fecerit, sacer esto; and frequently in the XII Tab.; CIL, i, 197, 10, 11, facito iudicetur; i, 202, 21, praeconem legunto; i, 198, 57, facito det; 58, quaestor accipito et habeto; i, 200, 28, eas faciunto pateant; especially frequent in the directions for farming given in Cato's de Agricultura, e.g. 4, villam pro copia aedificato; 5, 6, boves maxima diligentia habeto; 5, 7, scabiem caveto; frondem legito, eam substernito; 23, 2, uvas miscellas legito; 2, marmor si indes, in culleum libram indito; id indito in urnam, misceto cum musto; 3, resinam si indes, bene comminuito. Many chapters fairly bristle with future imperatives.

e) So too in proverbs and rules for conduct, e.g. Trin. 295, moribus vivo antiquis; 323, benefacta benefactis aliis pertegito; Curc. 28, ita tuom conferto amare semper; semper curato ne sis intestabilis; Cas. 210, semper huic verbo vitato; Pseud. 301, eme die caeca hercle olivom; id vendito oculata die; Ad. 417, hoc facito; hoc fugito.

f) Contracts, e.g. Poen. 1157, pactam rem habeto; Pers. 667, habeto.

g) Wishes, e.g. Capt. 452, bene ambulato; Merc. 327; Pers. 50. So also frequently *salveto*; see above, p. 358. Here belongs the expression, macte esto virtute, e.g. Pacuv. 146; Lucil. 143. Baehrens, Frag. p. 34, terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto.

h) Prayers, e.g. Cato, Agr. 132, 1; 2; Iuppiter, macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto, 134; 139; 141.

i) Challenges and Defiance, e.g. Phor. 1027, qui volet, lacessito; Men. 629, post me derideto.

j) Curses, Curc. 622, te Iuppiter male perdat; intestatus vivo; Ps. 1229, si mihi argentum dederis, te suspendito.

k) Invitations, e.g. Rud. 1417, hic hodie cenato.

l) Protases, e.g. Curc. 138, tu me curato ne sitiam; ego tibi quod amas adducam; Merc. 140, calidam picem bibito; aegritudo apscesse-rit; cf. also Amph. 520, muttito modo. Rud. 729, occipito illis adferre vim; te ego hinc ornatum amittam te ut non noveris; Cato, Agr. 157, 4, brassicam opponito; cito sanum faciet; bis in die oppo-nito; dolores auferet; 157, 10; 16.

m) Proviso, As. 240, modo tecum argentum adfero, facile patiar cetera. This is entirely equivalent to *modo adferas*, etc.

n) Concession, e.g. H. T. 572, esto, 'granted,' 'very well'; so Lucil. 771.

o) Permission (Wölfflin, Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, x, p. 130). This category is especially prominent. Examples: XII Tab. 1, ni it, igitur em capito; 3, in ius ducito; ni iudicatum facit, secum ducito; si volet maiore vincito; si volet, suo vivo; si volet, plus dato; As. 165, solus ductato, si dabis; 239; ut tibi lubebit, nobis legem imponito; Amph. 439, ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto sane Sosia; Capt. 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; Cas. 309, in furnum condito atque ibi torreto me; Cist. 111, si quid tibi opus erit, promito; Epid. 595, ubi voles pater esse, ibi esto; Men. 727, mea quidem hercle causa vidua vivo; 1029, mea quidem causa liber esto; M. G. 21, periuriorem hoc hominem si quis viderit, me sibi habeto; Most. 773, de exemplo meo ipse aedificato; 1164, amato, bibito, facito quod lubet; Pseud. 123, de istac re in oculum utrumvis conquiescito; 258; 513, at si non abstuleris? :: virgis cae-dito; 950; 1075; Trin. 266, apage te sis, Amor; tuas res tibi habeto; 570; And. 863, si invenies me mentitum, occidito; Phor. 143, ubi abiero, vel occidito; 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas; 984; H. T. 865, si voles, desponsam esse dicito; Eun. 596, si voles, lavato; 853; 1056, hoc si effeceris, quodvis donum a me optato; 1067; Ad. 970, liber esto.

According to Delbrück, the same usage occurs also in Sanskrit and Greek; Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 358.

NEGATIVE USES OF THE IMPERATIVE.

PRESENT TENSE.

Ne with the present imperative (a construction that has grown up on Latin soil; see p. 348) is fairly common in Early Latin (66 instances in Plautus; see Loch, p. 21; and 14 in Terence; Stahl, p. 38). Examples: Amph. 530, *ne corrumpes oculos*; 674, *ne time*; so also, 1064; Cas. 835; Curc. 520; Men. 136; Merc. 173; 891; 1004; M. G. 1346; Pseud. 922; Rud. 688; 1049; Trin. 1181; Amph. 1110, *ne pave*; so also Merc. 885; M. G. 895; Pseud. 103; As. 462, *ne formida*; so also 638; M. G. 893; 1011; Capt. 554, *ne verere*; Amph. 803, *ne interpella*; 810; 813; Truc. 896; As. 377, *ne nega*; so also 922; Bacch. 566; Stich. 715; As. 665, *ne nos diiunge*; 826, *ne mone*; Aul. 434, *ne doce*; Pers. 677; Bacch. 733, *ne interturba*; 833, *ne crepa*; Capt. 139, *ne fle*; Epid. 601; M. G. 1324; Cist. 751, *ne obloquere*; Merc. 501, *ne plora*; so Pseud. 1038; Poen. 1192, *ne lacruma*; so Stich. 20; Merc. 614, *animum ne desponde*; M. G. 215, *ne somno stude*; 1220, *ne parce*; Most. 641, *ne me roga*; 955, *ne molestus*; so Rud. 1254; Most. 1105, *ne nugare*; Pers. 227, *ne me attracta*; 490, *abi, ne iura*; Poen. 261, *ne obturba ac tace*; 543, *ne date*; 1229, *ne moramini*; Pseud. 734, *ne quaere*; Trin. 361, *ne opprobra*; 926, *ne male loquere*; Truc. 366, *ne abi*; And. 384, *ne nega*; 543, *ne obsecra*; 868, *ne saevi*; H. T. 84, *ne lacruma*; 85, *ne retice*, *ne verere*; 89, *ne labora*; 564, *ne nega*; 975, *ne te admisce*; Phor. 664, *ne clama*; 803, *ne nega*; Ad. 279, *ne time*; 802, *ne cura meum*.

Most of the foregoing, it will be noted, are short expressions with a tendency to become formulaic, as *ne time*, *ne pave*, *ne verere*, *ne nega*, *ne fle*, *ne lacruma*, *ne plora*. Outside of such expressions the usage had little vogue.

Ne with the present imperative accompanied by reinforcing words. There are few instances of this kind. I have noted only Curc. 137, *ne plora, amabo*; Merc. 321, *ne sis me obiurga*; Pers. 656, *ne sis plora*; H. T. 1052, *age quaeso, ne offirma te*; Eun. 95, *ne crucia te, obsecro*; Acc. 95, *ne retice, obsecro*.

NOLI, NOLITE, WITH THE INFINITIVE.

Of this there are 19 examples in Plautus (Loch, p. 23), 7 in Terence (Stahl, p. 43), and 9 in other Early Latin writers.

a) With *noli*: Amph. 540, *noli, amabo, irasci Sosiae*; Frag. xvii, *noli precari*; As. 417, *quaeso hercle noli hunc verberare*; Capt. 840, *noli irascier*; Cas. 204, *noli sis illic advorsari*; 387, *noli uxori credere*; Cist. 58, *noli, obsecro, imperare*; Curc. 197, *noli, amabo, verberare lapidem*; 697, *frater, obsecro te, noli hunc condemnatum perdere*; Merc. 934, *noli istuc, quaeso, dicere*; M. G. 372, *noli minitari*; 1129, *noli stare*; Most. 813, *noli facere mentionem ted emisse*; Pers. 622, *noli flere*; Poen. 370, *noli, amabo, suscensere ero meo*; 872, *noli (nolito, P) edepol devellisse*; 1129, *mirari noli neque contemplarier*; Trin. 627, *noli avorsari*; Truc. 674, *noli metuere*; And. 385, *suadere noli*; 685, *noli te macerare*; Phor. 556, *noli metuere*; Hec. 316, *noli fabularier*; 467, *noli fodere*; 654, *reduce ac noli advorsari*; Com. Incert. 87, *noli rogare*; Afran. 310, *noli cum patre coicere (nolim, MSS; noli, Mercer)*; 321, *noli credere*; Lucil. 401, *reprehendere noli*; Cato (Jord.) 37, 6, *noli noli peribere*; further, *noli* without inf.: Amph. 520, *ah noli!* Curc. 131a; Ad. 781, *noli, inquam*; Hec. 109, *noli*.

b) With *nolite* (not in Plautus), Enn. Ann. 142, *nolite morari*; Cato (Jord.) p. 67, 4, *nolite habere*; Crassus (Meyer, p. 263), *nolite sinere*; so Hec. 46; Enn. Trag. 303, *nolite ad me adire*.

An examination of the foregoing material shows that as compared with expressions of the type: *ne time*, the tendency is much less towards restriction to formulaic expressions.

As regards the logical value of both types (*ne fle*; *noli flere*), it should be noted that, while ordinarily styled 'prohibitions,' their force is less frequently that of peremptory commands than of requests, advice, or encouragement.

FUTURE TENSE.

In Early Latin *ne* with the future imperative is not found except in laws and the de Agr. of Cato, the diction of which imitates the legal style throughout. Examples: Lex Numae (Pliny, N. H. xiv, 12), *vino rogam ne respergito*; Lex Numae (Gell. iv, 3), *paelex asam*

Iunonis ne tacito (= *tangito*); Ver Sacrum (Livy, xxii, 10), ne fraus esto . . . ne populo scelus esto; Lex Numae (Fest. p. 178, M), ne supra genua tollito; XII Tab. 6, (Fest. p. 364 M), tignum iunctum aedibus vineave ne solvito; XII Tab. 10, (Cic. de Leg. ii, 23), hoc plus ne facito; rogum ascia ne polito; XII Tab. 10, (Cic. ii, 24), homini mortuo ne ossa legito; old proverb (Fest. p. 4, M), ne pomum ex alieno legito in armum; Cato, de Agr. 33, 3, ne serito; 144, 1, ne stringito; 144, 3, ne deportato; 145, 2, ne tangito; 145, 3, socium ne quem habeto; 146, 2, ne quid deportato; probably also in 49, 1, binas gemmas ne amplius relinquito, though some interpret the *ne* here as belonging exclusively with *amplius*; cf. 43, 2, vitibus et sulcos et propagines ne minus pedes IIS quoquo versus facito, where *ne* certainly goes with *pedes IIS*. In the following we find the form *ni, nei*: CIL, i, 197, 6, nei sinito; i, 199, 30, ni quis posideto; ibid. 36, vectigal invitei dare nei debento; i, 198, 69, quaestor moram nei facito; ibid. 71, quom (= *cum*) eis hace lege actio nei esto; i, 577, II, 1, disponito ni plus.

In the following, XII Tab. (Gell. xx, 1, 24), si nolet, arceram ne sternito, we have the only instance that I have noted of a negative permissive imperative, 'he need not spread, unless he chooses.' Blase, therefore, is in error when, Hist. Gramm. der Lat. Spr. iii, p. 249, Anm. 1, he asserts that the permissive use does not occur with negative imperatives.

Connecting Negatives with the Imperative.

These occur almost exclusively in connection with the future imperative.

1. **Present**: Only Stich. 20, ne lacruma neu tuo id amimo fac.

2. **Future**.

a) *Neve, neu, neive, nive*, Merc. 1021, neu quisquam posthac prohibeto; CIL, i, 197, 20, magistratum nei petito neive gerito, neive habeto . . . ni quis sinito neve eum censor in senatum legito; i, 199, 32, is eum agrum nei habeto nive fruimino; ibid. 34, ni quis prohibeto, nive quis vim facito, neive prohibeto quo minus; i, 198, 28, neive equom adimito neive quid ob eam rem fraudi esto; ibid. 71, avocarier iubeto neive abducito neive abducier iubeto neive facito; i, 200, 9, neive quis facito; i. 577, II, 21; Eph. Epigr. ii, 198, ne

quis fundatid, neve cadaver proiecitad neve parentatid; Cato, Agr. 144, 1, oleam ne stringito neve verberato; XII Tab. (Cic. de Leg. ii, 23), hominem mortuom in urbe ne sepelito neve urito; ibid. mulieres genas ne radunto neve lessum funeris ergo habento; 24, neve aurum addito.

b) *Neque*, Ver Sacrum (Livy, xxii, 10), profanum esto neque scelus esto; CIL, xi, 4766, honce loucom nequis violatod neque exvehito, neque exferito quod louci siet neque cedito; Cato, Agr. 145, oleum ne tangito utendi causa neque furandi causa; Poen. 1129, mirari noli neque me contemplarier; Appius Claudius (Baehrens), 2, amicum quom vides, obliviscere miserias; inimicus si es commentus, nec libens aequae.

NOLITO WITH THE INFINITIVE.

Nolito with the infinitive is rare. I have noted only the following examples in the entire range of Early Latin: Cist. 108, nolito acriter eum inelamare; Poen. 1321, nolito in serium convortere; Cato, Agr. 64, 1, nolito credere; 112, 1, nolito implere; 113, 2; 156, 6, nolito dare; Lucil. 722, nolito putare. In Poen. 872, the *P* MSS, read *nolito*, accepted by Lindsay.

CHAPTER VII.

THE INFINITIVE.¹

The forms of the Latin infinitive are by origin partly dative (*amari, moneri, regi*), partly locative (*esse, amare, audire*, etc.). But in Indo-European, owing to the relationship of the dative and locative, the dative function attached itself also to the locative formations, so that all infinitives possessed the general notion of direction. From this force there developed in Indo-European the infinitive of purpose, the infinitive as object of auxiliary verbs, the predicative use ('this pasture is not to rob;' i.e. to be robbed), and the infinitive in commands, as seen especially in Homer. See Delbrück, *op. cit.* p. 453; Brugmann, *op. cit.* p. 603.

Of these four Indo-European types of usage the Latin has inherited with certainty the first two. Concerning the possible presence in Latin of the infinitive in commands, see below under the Historical Infinitive. New uses of the infinitive, developed in the special history of the Latin itself, are the free use of the infinitive both with and without subject accusative as subject and object of verbs; also the restricted use of the infinitive as appositive and predicate. The origin of the infinitive without subject accusative as object is to be sought in such expressions as *propero ire*; *facere paro*; *facere occipio*, etc. Here the infinitive was originally one of purpose, but the connection of ideas naturally led to the feeling that the infinitive was the object, and thus paved the way for the freest use of the infinitive as object with a great variety of verbs.

The origin of the infinitive with subject accusative is probably to be sought in expressions like *me cogis ire*; *me subigis fateri*; *te iubeo scribere*; *cupio filiam desponderi*. From being the object of the main

¹ Walder, *Der Infinitiv bei Plautus*, 1874; Votsch, *De infinitivi usu Plautino*, 1874; Bartsch, *De infinitivo apud scaenicos poetas Latinos usu*, 1882; Reinkens, *Ueber den Accusativus cum infinitivo bei Plautus und Terentius*, 1886; Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik*⁴, p. 419 ff.; Delbrück, *Vgl. Syntax*, ii, p. 440 ff.; Brugmann, *Kurze Vgl. Gramm.* p. 603 ff.

verb, the accusative came to be felt as associated with the infinitive, and so led to the free use of the accusative as subject of the infinitive with a multitude of verbs of diverse meanings.

It seems natural to believe that the use of the infinitive as subject (whether with or without subject accusative) is later than its use as object.

The following classification of infinitive uses is based primarily on the presence or absence of subject accusative. Under each of these heads are grouped the various constructions of the infinitive as object, subject, appositive, and predicate. The infinitive of purpose, the infinitive in exclamations, and the historical infinitive will receive separate treatment.

THE INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE.

As OBJECT.

The infinitive with subject accusative is used with a large variety of verbs. Following a familiar and much used method of grouping, I have arranged these under the heads of *Verba Declarandi*; *Verba Sentiendi*; *Verba Affectuum*; *Verba Voluntatis*.

Verba Declarandi.

adfirmo: Pers. 140, numquam prius edes quam te hoc facturum *adfirmas*.

adiuro (6): Present: Men. 1025, per Iovem *adiuro* me tuum non esse; 656; Present with future force: Cist. 583, se *adiurat* mihi monstrare; Future: And. 694, *adiuro* numquam eam me deserturum; Perfect: Cist. 569, se eam *peperisse* *adiurabat*; Men. 616.

adnuo: Enn. Ann. 87, *adnuo* sese mecum decernere ferro, with future force.

adsimulo (13): Amph. 999, *adsimulabo* me esse ebrium; Asin. 581; Capt. 1007; And. 735, venire me *adsimulabo*; H. T. 333.

aio (over 200 instances): Present: Amph. 759, me *advenire* nunc primum *aio*; Merc. 296; And. 833, illum civem esse *aiunt*; Present with fut. force: Capt. 586, quod redimere se *ait*; Perfect: Capt. 979, gnatum meum tuo patri *ait* se *vendidisse*; H. T. 924, quod me

fecisse aiebas; Future (unusual): Men. 1043, ait se allaturum mar-suppiū; Truc. 204.

arguo (5): Perfect only: Amph. 1003, eum fecisse ille arguet quae ego fecero; Men. 814; M. G. 244; 337; 389.

autumo (16): Present: Bacch. 822, tun me odium esse autumas? Capt. 885; Present with fut. force: Most. 1132, quian me pro te ire ad cenam autumo? Perfect: Men. 8, omnis res gestas esse Athenis autumant; Pseud. 985; Atta, 6; Lucil. 562.

clamito: Aul. 818, quod pueri clamitant in faba se repperisse; And. 813.

commemoro: Epid. 171, eam qua ex commemores hanc filiam prognatam; Trin. 951.

comminiscor: Ad. 657, commenta mater est esse puerum natum.

confinco: Merc. Arg. 4, confingit servos emptam matri pedisequam.

confiteor: Present: H. T. 338, habeo aliud quod confiteamini sine periculo esse; Perfect: And. 607; Aul. 763, quam confessus mihi te abstulisse; Trin. 184.

convinco: H. T. 1017, metuis ne non convincas esse illum tuom?

deblatero: Aul. 268, deblateravisti vicinis omnibus meae me filiae daturum dotem.

declaro: Pseud. 682, hominem catum eum esse declaramus.

dedico: Acc. 78, te esse Alcimeonis fratrem dedicat.

deiero: Rud. 1336, deiera te mihi argentum daturum.

delico: M. G. 844, ut tu ipse me dixisse delices.

denego: Stich. 558, denegarit dare se granum tritici (the present here has future force); And. 241, denegarit se commissurum mihi.

dico (several hundred instances): Present: Men. 331, dicam te hic adstare Erotio; Present with fut. force: Asin. 366, dixit sese operam dare; Cas. 479, se locum dixit dare; Merc. 419; And. 411; Perfect: Merc. 401, neu te advexisse dixeris; H. T. 304, dicimus redisse te; Future: Amph. 919, testem quem te adducturum dixeris; Asin. 356; H. T. 500, dixeram operam daturum me.

dictito: H. T. 23, dictitat repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse musicum; Phor. 4; 743.

dissimulo: Most. 1071, dissimulabo me horum quicquam scire; Poen. 113.

edoceo: Pacuv. 374, id magis veri simile esse usus edocet.

enuntio: Poen. 888, ut ne enuntiet id esse facinus ex te ortum.
epistulam remisit: Truc. 397, remisit ad me epistulam sese expecturum.

exclamo: Eun. 23, exclamat furem, non poetam, fabulam dedisse.

excuso: Aul. 749, excusemus ebrios nos fecisse amoris causa.

exiuro: Amph. fr. vii, exiuravisti te mihi dixisse per iocum.

exprobro: Capt. 591, pergin servom me exprobrare esse?

expostulo: M. G. 697, opstetrix expostulavit mecum parum missum sibi.

expurgo: Capt. 620, me expurgare volo me insaniam neque tenere neque mi esse ullum morbum.

facio: H. T. 31, qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via decesse populum; Lucil. 727, purpuream uvam facit albam pampinum habere.

fateor (24): Present: Asin. 62, fateor eam esse importunam; And. 896, me amare hanc fateor; Perfect: Aul. 794, me iniuriam fecisse fateor; Hec. 828, se fatetur nescio quam compressisse.

fidem do: Cist. 236, do (fidem) non facturum esse me; M. G. 453; 455; Rud. 953; Hec. 112, si mihi fidem das te taciturnam.

hariolor: Asin. 316, hariolari sibi esse in mundo malum.

indico: Merc. 352, illam me emissem indico; Hec. 395, quod te scire ipsa indicat res; Ad. 338; Eun. 53.

insimulo: Amph. 902, nisi hoc falso dici insimulaturus es.

intendo: Eun. 525, hanc se intendit esse.

interminor: Present: Pseud. 776, interminatust eum cras perbitere, with fut. force; Future: Asin. 363, interminatust nos futuros ulmeos.

interpello: Merc. 201, interpello matri te ancillam tuae emissem.

itero: Turp. 140, festum esse hinc quartum diem hodie iterant.

iuro (9): Present: Amph. 435, iuro me esse neque me falsum dicere; 436; Present with fut. force: Pers. 401, iuratust sese hodie argentum dare; Future: M. G. 1411, iura te non nociturum nemini; 1414; Ad. 332, iurabat se unum numquam victurum diem; 473; Perfect: CIL, i, 198, 18, iurato sese eos ex hac lege legisse.

ius iurandum do: Present: Amph. 931, ius iurandum dabo me meam pudicam esse uxorem arbitrarier; Hec. 697, dabo ius iurandum nil esse istorum mihi; Ad. 166; Perfect: Most. 1084, ius iurandum pollicitust dare se, neque se hasce aedes vendidisse; Poen. 1394; Future: Bacch. 1028, ius iurandum dedi daturum id me.

laudo: Cato, fr. (Jord.) 33, 9, laudant me id comparavisse.

mentionem facio: Most. 813, noli facere mentionem ted emissee.

memoro (13): Present: Bacch. 1096, miles memorat meretricem esse eam; Enn. Ann. 114; Perfect: Capt. 577, tune te gnatum memoras liberum?

minor: Asin. 604, minatur se abire, with fut. force; H. T. 489, abiturum se esse minabitur.

minitor: Asin. 611, minitaris te vitam esse amissurum; Amph. Frag. xi.

narro: Present: H. T. 192, quid narrat? :: se miserum esse; 711; Phor. 366; Perfect: Amph. 467, narrabit servom sese amovisse; Rud. 64; Hec. 145; Future: Asin. 367, narra ut acturi sumus: te futurum esse atriensem.

nego (42): Present: Amph. 434, tu negas med esse? And. 612, negabon velle me? Perfect: Amph. 758, te abisse negas? 760; H. T. 18, id esse factum hic non negat; Future: Cas. 323, negavi ipsi me concessurum Iovi; And. 148, ut se filiam neget daturum; 405.

nuntio (14): Present: Merc. 279, nunties negotium mihi esse in urbe; Trin. 773; Perfect: Pseud. 1198, nunties abduxisse alium praedam; Hec. 314, me venisse nuntia; Future: Phor. 777, nuntia hanc venturam.

nuntius: Men. 37, rediit nuntius puerum surruptum patremque esse emortuom.

obiecto: Most. 810, cave illi obiectes te has emissee!

obicio: Epid. 664, neque obiciet mihi pedibus sese provocatum; Lucil. 294, Scipiadae magno obiciebat lustrum illo censore malum fuisse.

ostendo: Present: H. T. 438, si te leni esse animo ostenderis; 933; Phor. 597; Ad. 124; 142; 364; 986; Perfect: Acc. 17, me non peccasse ostendam.

perhibeo: Pacuv. 366, Fortunam insanam esse perhibent philosophi.

pernego: Eun. 34, eas factas prius Latinas scisse sese, id pernegat.

polliceor: Bacch. 742, id pollicetur se daturum aurum; Most. 1084, ius iurandum pollicitust dare se, with fut. force; Hec. 679, pollicitast se concessuram ex aedibus.

pono ('I assume'): Phor. 630, pono esse victum eum.

portendo: Acc. Praet. 35, commutationem rerum portendit fore perpropinquam.

praedico (22): Present: Amph. 359, me esse familiarem praedico; Perfect: Amph. 730, cur praedicas te me vidisse? Phor. 725, ne se eiectionem praedicet; Afran. 403.

praedico: Pacuv. 138, hoc est quod fore praedixit.

praesagio: Aul. 178, praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire.

proco: Liv. And. Trag. 13, parere vos maiestas mea procat.

profiteor: Trag. Incert. 52, quem ego me profiteor esse.

promitto: Present with fut. force: Bacch. 969a, quos dare se promisit; Merc. 631; Rud. 540; Future: Aul. 219, promitte hoc fore; Curc. 709; M. G. 326; Poen. 422; Pseud. 901; Hec. 791; Fut. Pass.: Curc. 490, memento promisisse te argentum redditum iri.

queror: Cist. 504, quod factum queror.

renuntio: Bacch. 157, te esse mortuom renuntiem; H. T. 859, quid nunc renuntiem abs te responsum? And. 508.

repromitto: Asin. 454, repromittam solutam rem futuram.

respondeo: Present: Curc. 334; Merc. 943; M. G. 179; Perfect: Capt. 899, tuom advenisse filium respondeo.

rumor est: And. 185, meum gnatum rumor est amare; Hec. 39, rumor venit datum iri gladiatores.

scribo: Curc. 591, poetam audiavi scripsisse mulieres duas peiores esse quam unam; Phor. 6, nusquam insanum scripsit adulescentulum cervam videre fugere; Asin. 760.

signum: H. T. 298, magnum hoc quoque signumst dominam esse extra noxiam.

simulo (18): Present: Men. 125, se uxori simulat male loqui; And. 472, hanc simulant parere; H. T. 943; Hec. 184; 188; Turp. 84; Perfect: Epid. 373, quae se emptam simulet; Truc. 18.

spondeo: Epid. 8, spondeo me accepturum; Trin. 1162, filiam tuam sponden mi uxorem dari?

testis: Present: Capt. 5, testes estis me verum loqui; Perfect: Amph. 919, testem te huc non venisse; Men. 812; Future: Capt. 426, Iovem testem laudo me infidelem non futurum Philocrati; 428; Pseud. 514.

verba inicio: H. T. 892, iniecissem verba Dromonem scilicet sponsae vestem opus esse.

vinco: Amph. 433, vincon te non esse Sosiam? Cato, fr. (Jord.) 77, 3, vincam nequissimum et indocile esse genus illorum.

voveo: Curc. 72, me inferre Veneri vovi iaientaculum; 181, Venerin pervigilare te vovisti; both with fut. force.

Verba Sentiendi.

accipio: M. G. 1287, quom multos multa admesse acceperim; And. 397, si te aequo animo ferre accipiet.

adspicio: Merc. 220, aspicit te timidum esse; Hec. 367, postquam me aspexere ancillae advenisse; Enn. Ann. 260, quom aspiciunt hostes accedere.

animum advorto: Phor. 909, id vos velle animum advorteram.

arbitror (61): Present: Amph. 675, me meum officium facere arbitror; And. 60, id arbitror esse utile; Aul. 120; And. 812; 959; Perfect: Rud. 537, iure optumo me elavisse arbitror; Asin. 461; Hec. 839, me fecisse arbitror; Future: Hec. 299, tum matrem me aut uxorem in culpa inventurum arbitror.

audio (57): Present: Amph. 752, audivistin hodie me illi dicere? Cist. 170; And. 474, postquam ante ostium me audivit stare; 858; H. T. 421; Perfect: Bacch. 949, Ulixem audivi fuisse audacem; Curc. 591; Phor. 39, erilem filium duxisse audio uxorem; 575; Future: And. 173, ubi nuptias futuras esse audivit; Pass.: 177, postquam audierat non datum iri filio uxorem suo.

ausculto: Pseud. 523a, satis lubenter te ausculto loqui.

censeo (over 100 instances): Present: Asin. 485, erum nos fugitare censes? Men. 636; 924; Eun. 217, censen posse me perpeti? 720; 1072; Present with fut. force: Aul. 528, aes censet dari; Most. 1005, ne me vocare censeas; Perfect: Aul. 240, ne me thensauros repperisse censeas; Bacch. 342; Phor. 327, quot me censes homines deverberasse? Future: Pers. 415, non mihi censebas copiam argenti fore; Trin. 71.

cerno: Cist. 1, quom ego antehac te amavi et mihi amicam esse crevi; Acc. 289, Amfilocum huc vadere cerno; 499, te cerno vadere; 675; Titin. 50, simul ut pueras hasce suspirare crevi.

cogito: Capt. 432, cogitato hinc mea fide mitti domum te; Aul. 591; Poen. 240; Ad. 32, uxor te amare cogitat; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; 39, 2.

cognosco: Present: Cist. 179, eam cognoscit esse quam com-

presserat; Men. 429; Poen. 1374; Perfect: Hec. 811, cognosse anulum illum gnatae suae fuisse; Epid. Arg. 6.

cognitio facta est: Hec. 831, inde est cognitio facta Philumenam compressam esse.

commemini: Men. 1074, non commemorasti te mecum exire ex navi?

comperio(r): And. 90, comperiebam nil ad Pamphilum attinere; 145; 902, dum ne ab hoc me falli comperiar; Hec. 763; Acc. 601.

confido: Future only: Cure. 143, confido parasitum hodie adventurum; Merc. 746; Pers. 286; 627; Poen. 1165; Rud. 633; Trin. 460; H. T. 159, illum salvom adventurum esse confido; Inf. in -assere: Aul. 687, istuc confido me impetrassere; Capt. 167, illum confido me reconciliassere.

confidentia: M. G. 229, confidentiast nos inimicos profligare posse; Pseud. 763, confidentiast inimicos me posse perdere.

coniectura: And. Alt. Ex. 18, id ita esse facere coniecturam ex me licet.

consciis: Hec. 392, parturire eam nec gravidam ex te solus consciu's; Ad. 348, conscia mihi sum a me culpam esse hanc procul.

consentio: Aul. Calatinus, Baehrens, p. 37, hunc consentiunt primarium fuisse virum; CIL, i, 31, hunc oinom ploirume cosentiont optumo fuisse viro.

conspicio: Enn. Ann. 55, 20, conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse priora.

conspicor: Present: Bacch. 279, lembum conspicor exornarier; Cas. 40; Cure. 595; Bacch. 669; Perfect: Amph. 1070, illam geminos peperisse conspicor.

credo (over 150 instances): Present: M. G. 1391, omnis se amare credit; Cas. 217; 759; And. 341, quem credo toto me oppido quaerere; 432; Cato, Agr. 64, 1; Perfect: Aul. 815, credo illum anum adisse; Rud. 397; H. T. 623, ne quid credas me facere esse ausam; Eun. 679, an tu hunc credidisti esse ad nos deductum; Future: Asin. 398, credo eum adfuturum; Rud. 1186; H. T. 591, quid illum porro credas facturum? Eun. 739; Future in -assere: M. G. 1128, credo te facile impetrassere.

deputo: Amph. 159, me omnes esse dignum deputent; Phor. 246, omne id deputare esse in lucro; 251; Hec. 477; 799.

diiudico: Amph. 677, quam esse optumam diiudicat.

duco (9): Present: Amph. 839, non illam mihi dotem duco esse; Capt. 436; Most. 125; Pers. 637; Trin. 638; Afran. 324; Perfect: Curc. 513, male dictum id esse duco; H. T. 836, quas pro alimentis esse nunc duco datas; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 233, gloriae sibi ducebat, talentum ob unam fabulam datum esse.

existumo: (11): Present: Capt. 325, non lucrum omne esse utile existumo; Most. 305; 909; Eun. 758, metuo qualem me esse hominem existumes; Phor. 369; Hec. 7c; 604; Lucil. 548; Perfect: Stich. 162, minus laboris cepisse illam existumo; Ad. 13, furtumne factum existumetis an locum repressum.

expor: Stich. 509, te amicum expor esse; Truc. 529, id ita esse experta es; nunc experiere me te amare; Bacch. 387.

falsus sum: Aul. 123, haud falsa sum nos odiosas haberi.

fides, fidem habeo: H. T. 571, mihi fides apud hunc est nil me istius facturum; Eun. 139, si fidem habeat se iri praepositum tibi.

habeo pro, sic habeo: Asin. 628, qui pro cibo habeas te verberari; Cato, Agr. Prooem. sic habuerunt et ita in legibus posiverunt furem dupli condemnari.

indaudio: Capt. 30, indaudivit captum esse equitem Aleum; M. G. 442, hic sororem esse indaudivi; Stich. 77, quasi indaudiverim eas meruisse culpam; Aul. 266.

inspecto: Rud. 1021, inspectavi procul te hunc habere.

intellego (37): Present: Bacch. 344, id mi haud licere intellego; Cas. 11; Cist. 627; And. 500, an tute intellexti hoc adsimulari? H. T. 412; Perfect: Bacch. 390, illum intellego invenisse; Epid. 281; Men. 497; H. T. 843, te intellego resipisse; Future: H. T. 478, si intellexerit prius proditum te tuam vitam; Pass. Periphr. Rud. 101, villam integundam intellego totam.

invenio: Present: M. G. 1375, eum fidelem esse invenio; Hec. 300, quod quom ita esse invenero; 845; Lucil. 602; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 232; Perfect: Most. 477, id adeo nos nunc factum invenimus; And. 863, si quicquam invenies me mentitum; Hec. 777.

iudico: Cas. 375, optimum istuc esse iudico; Eun. 29, id ita esse iudicare poteritis; Ad. 892.

memini: Present: Cist. 552, mihi memini adferri parvolam puellam; Curc. 651; Epid. 554; 639; Men. 1113; Pseud. 1089;

Asin. 926; Asin. 333; H. T. 626, meministin te maximo opere edicere nolle tolli; Phor. 74; Hec. 822; Naev. Trag. 6, auri fonte lavere me memini manum; Trag. Incert. 193; Enn. Ann. 10, memini me fiere pavom; Perfect: Curc. 490, memento promisisse te; Aul. 258, illud memineris convenisse.

in memoriam regredior, in memoria habeo: Capt. 1023, in memoriam regredior audisse me; Poen. 1278, facito in memoria habeas tuam filiam mihi te despondisse.

nescio: Bacch. 814, nescis nunc venire te; Capt. 29; Eun. 736, nescibam id dicere illam; Lucil. 22, si me nescire hoc nescis.

nosco, novi: Ad. 862, id esse verum quovis facilest noscere; Eun. 778, imperatoris virtutem noveram et vim militum; sine sanguine hoc non posse fieri.

obliscor: Merc. 481, satine ut oblitus fui tibi me narravisse; Truc. 235, qui, quod dedit, id oblitust datum.

opinor (21): Present: Cas. 473, non opinor fieri hoc posse; Epid. 306; Hec. 772, neque has respicere deos opinor; Ad. 648; Perfect: Hec. 95, haud opinor commode finem statuisset orationi militem; 845; Future: Pers. 257, neque opinabar neque censebam eam fore mihi occasionem; And. 387.

opinio est: Cist. 320, hanc eam esse opinio est.

percipio: Asin. 36; 162, magis istuc percipimus lingua dici quam factis fore; Most. 727; Lucil. 728.

perdisco: Asin. 187, perdidici istaec esse vera.

persentisco: Merc. 687, poterat persentiscere illam esse amicam tui viri.

praesentio: And. 839, quom me adesse neuter praesenserat.

puto (35): Present: Amph. 284, deos esse tui similis putas; Curc. 511; And. 113, haec putabam esse humani ingeni; H. T. 115, me putavit plus scire; Cato, Agr. 111; 114, 1; Perfect: Merc. 350, induci ut putet matri ancillam emptam esse illam; H. T. 842, me fortunatissimum factum puto esse; Future: Merc. 654, amorem te hic relicturum putas? Most. 195; Hec. 500, is sibi me supplicaturum putat?

reor (28): Present: Amph. 656, quos nemo posse superari ratus est; Aul. 205; Hec. 581, te quod me amare rebar; Perfect: Most. 158, nec quom me melius rear esse defecatum; Acc. 96, tu meam

benevolentiam interisse es ratus? Future: Hec. 819, uxorem quam numquam est ratus se habiturum.

reperio: Hec. 58, quam paucos reperias fidelis evenire amatores! Ad. 861.

rescisco (9): Present: Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; And. 400, puerum ne resciscat mi esse ex illa; H. T. 670; Perfect: Capt. 945, ubi rescivi mihi data esse verba; Merc. 107; Hec. 208, me immerito esse accusatam post rescisces.

scio (over 100 instances): Present: Amph. 510, te sciat operam dare; Men. 251; And. 95, scias posse habere iam ipsum suae vitae modum; 859; Pres. with fut. force; Most. 17, te in pistrinum scis actutum tradier; Cato, Agr. 1, 5; 143, 1; Perfect: Aul. 729, scit peperisse filiam; H. T. 396, me semper scio fecisse sedulo; Future: Pseud. 115, ut me eefecturum quod promisi scias; H. T. 176, illam hic adfuturum hodie scio; Fut. Passive: Cas. 699, nisi se sciat vilico non datum iri.

scilicet: Cure. 263, item alios deos facturos scilicet; Rud. 395, nunc eam cum navi scilicet abisse pessum in altum; H. T. 359, scilicet facturum me esse; 892.

scisco: Bacch. 302, ut illi id factum sciscerent.

sentio (43): Present: Capt. 140, sensi filio meo te esse amicum; Cas. 58; And. 173, ita Davom modo timere sensi; 196; Perfect: Epid. 92a, ubi senserit sibi data esse verba; Merc. 334; H. T. 860, ne sentiat me sensisse.

somnio: M. G. 392, id me insimulatam falsum esse somniavi; Pers. 257; Ad. 724, tu de psaltria me somnias agere; Enn. Frag. 499 (Baehr.), videbar somniare me esse mortuom.

specto: Amph. 152, spectantibus Iovem et Mercurium facere histrioniam; Rud. 1249, spectavi comicos ad istunc modum sapienter dicta dicere.

spero (30): Present, with fut. force: Rud. 589, itaque alvom prodi speravit nobis salsis poculis; 996; Truc. 936; Eun. 520, sperat se a me avellere; 920; Future: Amph. 718, speravi istam parituram filium; Capt. 780; Cas. 53; Perfect: Capt. 757; And. 407, orationem sperat invenisse se; H. T. 746; Eun. 203.

spes: Capt. 957, ne spem ponas me bonae frugi fore; Epid 332,

spes est fore mecum fortunam; Stich. 22, spes est eum melius facturum; H. T. 981, est spes nos esituros satis; Phor. 691, iniectast spes patri posse illam extrudi; Future Pass.: Truc. 886, spes tactuari (= *tactum iri*) militem.

spicio: Cure. 155, re spicio nihili meam vos gratiam facere.

suspikor (15): Present: Aul. 110, me suspicentur habere; Bacch. 61; Merc. 925; Eun. 435, eam me amare suspicatast; Perfect: Bacch. 683, Bacchidem suspicabar mi male consuluisse; Merc. 254; H. T. 1014, subditum se suspicatur; Future: Hec. 365, suspicans morbo me visurum adfectam.

suspicio: Bacch. 890, sentio suspicio quae te sollicitet: eum esse cum illa muliere; Cist. 317, suspiciost eam esse; Pseud. 562, suspicio est mi nunc vos suspicari; Eun. 514, tum erat suspicio dolo malo haec fieri omnia.

video (over 100 instances): Present: Amph. 41, alios vidi commemorare quae bona vobis fecissent; Bacch. 292; And. 363, intro ire neminem video; Perfect: Cist. 298, video te Amoris tactum toxico; Poen. 68; St. 411; Trin. 109; Eun. 1015, ubi vestem vidit illam esse eum indutum; Hec. 680; Future: Trin. 721, video caculam militarem me futurum.

videlicet: Stich. 555, videlicet parcum fuisse illum senem; 557, videlicet non fuisse illum nequam adolescentem; Asin. 599.

Verba Affectuum.

admiror: Amph. 89, quid admirati estis Iovem facere histrioniam?

crucior: Capt. 600, crucior lapidem non habere me; H. T. 673

euro: Lucil. 536, coquos non curat caudam insignem esse.

demiror: Cas. 219, coquos demiror eo condimento non utier; Merc. 698.

disrucior: Bacch. 435, propter me haec nunc meo sodali dici disrucior.

doleo: Most. Arg. 10, se derisum dolet.

fero graviter: And. 191, graviter sibi dari uxorem ferunt.

ferox est: Asin. 468, ferox est xx minas meas tractare sese.

formido: Bacch. 237, meus formidat animus nostrum tam diu desiderare neque redire filium.

gaudeo (22): Present: Bacch. 185, venire tu me gaudes; 456; Cist. 777; Eun. 976, salvom te advenire gaudeo; Perfect: Cas. 568, quem litem perdidisse gaudeo; Men. 1134; Most. 448; H. T. 816, me istuc ex te prius audisse gaudeo.

gratias ago: Phor. 596, dis gratias agebat tempus sibi dari.

gratulor: Stich. 386, decumam esse adauctam tibi quam vovi gratulor; H. T. 880, desiste deos gratulando obtundere tuam esse inventam gnatam.

gratiam habeo: And. 42, id gratum fuisse advorsum te habeo gratiam.

ira incendor: Hec. 562, incendor ira esse ausam facere haec te.

invideo: Bacch. 543, nullus est quoi non invideant rem secundam optingere.

laetor: H. T. 683, istuc tibi optigisse laetor; Hec. 833.

laetus sum: Naev. Trag. 15, laetus sum laudari me abs te.

maereo: Matius, 1, corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni.

maestus sum: Curc. 336, abeo ab illo maestus med illo frustra advenisse; Most. 796, sed ut maestust sese hasce vendidisse!

miror: Cas. 539, miror huc iam non arcessi uxorem meam; Most. 186; Poen. 233; 1347.

moror (with *nīl*): Bacch. 153, nil moror discipulos mi esse iam plenos sanguinis; Cist. 778; Epid. 686; M. G. 447; Poen. 1273; Trin. 337; Acc. 8.

odi: Com. Incert. 95, odi puerulos praecoqui sapientia.

patior (31): Cist. 500, patierin me peiierare? Men. 1010; And. 203, ubivis facilius passus sim me deludier; H. T. 443; Acc. 8; aegre patior: Bacch. 492, viden ut aegre patitur gnatum esse corruptum tuom? Merc. 251; Poen. 1071; Enn. Trag. 91.

pendo nili: Eun. 94, istuc abs te factum nili penderem!

perfero: Most. 1170, aliud quidvis impetrari a me facilius perferam.

perpetior: Capt. 88, nisi qui colaphos perpeti potes frangique aulas in caput; 132; Amph. 887; Asin. 845; Trin. 660; 732; 1165; Eun. 551, nunc est profecto interfici quom perpeti me possum.

rideo: Naev. Com. 120, risi egomet mecum cassabundum ire ebrium.

tolero: Enn. Ann. 91, ferro se caedi quam his dictis toleraret.

vereor: M. G. 1284, ni sciam, verear me hoc ornatu incedere.
voluptatem capio: Afran. 357, voluptatem capio cruciari te.

Verba Voluntatis.

abnuto: Enn. Trag. 306, quid te adiri abnutas?

cogo: Capt. 13, histrionem cogis mendicari; Epid. 586; Pseud. 150; Hec. 243, ut te cogam quae ego imperem facere; Ad. 652; Lucil. 746, tibi me haec ostendere cogunt; 785.

constituo: Hec. 195, constitui cum quodam hospite me esse illum conventuram; 437.

consuefacio: Ad. 74, consuefacere filium sua sponte recte facere.

cupio (18): Aul. 172, cupio filiam desponderi; Cas. 397, omnis te imitari cupis; Curc. 724; Epid. 77; Most. 61; 301; Poen. 870; Pseud. 448; 468; Most. 349, Iupiter me perisse cupit; H. T. 428, quous te fieri participem cupis; Hec. 265; Ad. 698; Pacuv. 287, me perbitere cupio.

decerno: And. 238, uxorem decrerat dare se mi hodie; H. T. 147; 940; Hec. 148; 542; Fut.: Hec. 586, ego rus abituram me esse decrevi.

dehortor: Cato, fr. (Jord.) 27, 1, multa me dehortata sunt huc prodire.

desidero: Cas. 423, plura verba (fieri) non desidero; Merc. 148; Stich. 514.

exopto: M. G. 1135, quos videre exoptabam me, exeuntis video.

expeto: Most. 128, nituntur ut alii sibi esse illorum similis expectant; 628, id me scire expeto; Trin. 365; 652; Perfect: Hec. 727, non hoc de nihilost quod me nunc conventam esse expetit; Pacuv. 206, di me esse adiutam expetunt.

gestio: Asin. 788, illam moveri gestio; Phor. 260, ipsum gestio dari mi in conspectum.

impero: Cato, Agr. 141, 1, impera suovetaurilia circumagi.

induco in animum: H. T. 49, eum esse quaestum in animum induxi maxumum; Hec. 292.

induco animum: Trin. 704, id me commissurum ne animum induxeris; CIL, i, 201, 6, ea animum nostrum non indoucebamur ita facta esse; And. 572, si istuc animum induxti esse utile; H. T. 41; Hec. 264; 277; Scipio, Meyer, p. 214; Cato, fr. (Jord.) 42, 9; Passive: Pers. 67, animus induci potest eum esse civem bonum.

iubeo (very frequent): Bacch. 95, argentum iubebo iam intus efferri foras; Epid. 68; H. T. 585, iube hunc abire aliquo! Hec. 301.

malo (38): Amph. 511, faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis; Asin. 121, moriri sese mavolet; 811, emori me malim; Bacch. 452; 465, illum meum malum promptare malim quam peculium; 490; 519c; 859; 1118, nisi mavoltis fores comminui; Capt. 516, nunc est quom me fuisse quam esse mavelim; Cas. 290; Cist. 766, illius istanc esse malo gratiam; Men. 720; Most. 179, laudari multo malo quam meam speciem alios inridere; Pers. 602, te malo eumpse adire; Poen. 301; 303; Rud. 853; Stich. 80; Truc. 153; 277; 743; Vid. xiii; xv; And. 430, se illam amplecti maluit; 529, quid alias quam hodie has fieri nuptias? H. T. 268; Eun. 66; 762; Phor. 658; Hec. 540; Ad. 311; Enn. Trag. 358, eos reduci quam relinqui malui; Acc. 18; Stat. 49, nisi sese malit pessum dari; Afran. 34; Naev. B. P. 39, sese perire mavolunt. In this construction the subject of the infinitive is more usually the same as that of the governing verb.

moneo: Plaut. Frag. 26, ubi is te monebat esse.

nolo (46): Amph. 86, mirari nolim vos; 751; Asin. 386, nolo fores verberarier; 658; 789; Bacch. 99; 1064; Capt. 264; 587; 942, te nolim suscensere; Cist. 83, nolo me meretricem dicier; 232, me nolo fortem perhiberi virum; Curc. 316; Epid. 42; 70; Merc. 420; Most. 176; 194; 287; 332; Pers. 613; 619; Poen. 1005; 1037; 1079, te moneri num nevis? 1267; Pseud. 492; 714; Rud. 619; qui se scelere fieri nolunt nobilis; 1404; Stich. 48; 630; 720; Trin. 281; 685; 979; 1060; Truc. 546; And. 573, nolo tibi ullum commodum in me claudier; H. T. 323; 433; Hec. 348; 593; 758; Ad. 162, hanc iniuriam nolle factam esse (perfect); Stat. 183, tu nurum non vis odiosam tibi esse? In this construction the subject of the infinitive is more usually *not* the same as that of the governing verb.

opto: And. 797, quae sese inhoneste optavit parere ditias; 962, quem ego mihi potissimum optem dari? Enn. Ann. 403, omnes mortales sese laudarier optant; Lucil. 201, ipsum quid facere optes; H. T. 757.

perdoceo: Pseud. 874, quanti istuc unum me coquinare perdoces?

pervolo: Cas. 862, nunc pervelim progredi senem.

peto: Pseud. 683, quod cupienter dari petimus nobis.

porceo: Lucil. 200, non te porro procedere porcent.

postulo: Amph. 891, fieri quod illaec postulat; Asin. 189, te eam ductare postules; 506; Aul. 361; Capt. 339, ego me amitti non postulo; Cas. 127; 141; 193, postulat vilico suo se dare; Cist. 374; Men. 443; 766, quae viros supservire sibi postulant; 795; M. G. 302, mi nil credi postulo; Poen. 544; Pseud. 378; 438; 853; Rud. 990; Stich. 488; Trin. 237; 1022; Truc. 142; 863; 928; And. 331 postulare id gratiae adponi sibi; 644; H. T. 671; 1011, iniquos es, qui me tacere postules; Eun. 480; Hec. 564; Ad. 200; 879, a meis me amari postulo; Future: Rud. 543, iam postulabas te totam Siciliam devoraturum?

praeopto: Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire.

prohibeo: Epitaph of App. Claudius (Dessau, i, p. 16), pacem fieri cum Pyrrho rege prohibuit; Aul. 435, prohibes nos coquere; Curc. 35, nemo ire quemquam prohibet; Trin. 370; Hec. 266, quae res te facere id prohibet? Acc. 440.

sino (very frequent): Amph. 264, neque hunc hominem sinam accedere; Bacch. 174; Eun. 124; Ad. 97; Lucil. 645.

studeo: Amph. 892, si me illam studeam recipere; Asin. 67, ego me id facere studeo; Stich. 52, neque est quor studeam has nuptias mutarier; And. Alt. Ex. 9; Eun. 1, si quisquamst qui placere se studeat bonis; 313; Phor. 767, dici nos bonos studemus; Hec. 265; Acc. 21, cuiatis stirpem funditus fligi studet; Afran. 197, quem mihi studeo iam dudum dari.

suadeo: Hec. 481, nunc me pietas matris commodum suadet sequi; Phor. 828 is uncertain.

subigo: Lucil. 752, tun me succedere aratro subigas?

tardo: Trag. Incert. 170, illum ut maeror tardaret sequi.

volo (very frequent, —over 250 instances):

a) The subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the governing verb (30): Amph. 662, id se volt experiri; Asin. 183; volt placere sese amicae; 687, exorariet vis ted; Aul. 823; Capt. 920, si sese uti volet; Cas. 287, id velim me scire; Epid. 120, operam Epidici nunc me emere velim; M. G. 678, me volo vivere; Most. 167, volo me placere Philolachi; 218; 856; Pers. 62; 825; Poen. 265, an te vis inter istas vorsarier? 338; 340; Pseud. 167; 329; 1042; 1189,

fricari sese ex antiquo volunt; Rud. 209; Stich. 422, volo me eleutheria capere; 701; Trin. 324; Truc. 922, gaudere aliqui me volo; 927; Eun. 248, qui esse primos se omnium rerum volunt; Ad. 504, si vos vultis perhiberi probos; Pacuv. 23, qui sese adfines esse ad causandum volunt; Acc. 5, ea me uti volo.

b) The subject of the infinitive is different from that of the governing verb (200+), e.g. Amph. 5, res rationesque bene expedire vultis; 8; 13; 593, id volo dici; 769; Asin. 16, vis gnatum superesse; 646, vin erum deludi? Aul. 87, araneas servari volo; 149, volo te uxorem ducere; Bacch. 58, apud me te esse volo; 76; 93; 530; Capt. 175, te vocari ad te ad cenam volo; 360; Cas. 281, te volo mecum loqui; 732, nisi me vis vomere; Cist. 29, nil volunt nos potesse; 148; 591; Curc. 133, hoc volo scire te; 658; Epid. 114, quid me vis facere; Men. 51, si quis quid curari sibi velit; Merc. 272, illunc hireum castrari volo; 776; M. G. 96, volo vos scire; 906; Most. 100; 628; Pers. 510, hospitium isti praehiberi volo; 515; Poen. 657, locum sibi velle praeberier; 681; Rud. 33; 183; Stich. 98, quibus voluisti esse nos matres familias; 103; Trin. 9; 39; Truc. 558, puras esse sibi volt aedis; 840; And. 50, quid facere te velim; 898; H. T. 164; Eun. 283, num quem evocari hinc vis foras? 979; Phor. 291, num quid me facere voluisti? 305; Hec. 252; 473; Ad. 399, ut quisque suum volt esse, itast; Acc. 488; Stat. 51; 261; Turp. 37; 146; Enn. Ann. 143, 4; 345; 391; Lucil. 127; 480; Scipio, Meyer, p. 214; Cato, Agr. 2, 6; fr. (Jord.) 25, 4.

In a few instances we have the perfect infinitive in this construction: Amph. 33, iustam rem esse oratam a vobis volo; Cas. 21, vos omnes opere magno esse oratos volo; Phor. 792, virum me natum vellem. In Phor. 792 the perfect denotes prior action; in the other examples the action looks towards the future, and the force of the tense does not differ from the present.

In a number of passages sometimes taken as perfect infinitives with omitted *esse*, we should probably recognize merely predicate participles. See under Participles, p. 438.

voto: Asin. 522, te votui compellare; 536; Capt. 703, votuin te quicquam mi falsum proloqui? Epid. 67a; Men. 848; Merc. 110; M. G. 830; Poen. 456, votui exta prosicari; Pseud. 1291; Truc. 641; Afran. 93, votuit me remeare in ludum.

Dependent on the Context.

Often the infinitive with subject accusative is not dependent upon any particular word, but upon the notion of saying or thinking involved in the context, e.g. Epid. 251, *adlatae sunt tabellae eum argentum sumpsisse*; Merc. 47, *iniustitiam lenonum expromere*; *lacerari valide suam rem*; 464, *at me incusato: te fecisse sedulo*; M. G. 262, *non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem participaverit, sese vidisse*; M. G. 1184, *Philocomasium arcessito . . . nisi eat, te soluturum esse navim*; *ventum operam dare*; Pers. 165, *puerum volo mittere . . . med esse efecturum*; Poen. 771, *id nunc his cerebrum uritur, me ccc Philippos facturum lucri*; Pseud. 418, *sermoni omnibust, eum velle amicam liberare*; Truc. 439, *ostendit sese medullitus: se mi infidelem numquam fore*; Phor. 214, *par pari respondeas . . . vi coactum te esse*; 598, *hominem ad forum iussi opperiri: eo me esse adducturum senem*; Ad. 162, *quod te purges, hanc iniuriam mihi nolle factam esse*; Turp. 136, *litteras misi, processe nobis mercaturam*.

Infinitive as Object, with Subject Accusative Understood.

With many of the categories enumerated in the preceding pages, the subject accusative is often understood, both when it is the same as the subject of the governing verb, and when it refers to another person or thing. The following are the most important instances of this usage:

abdico: Pacuv. 55, *consanguineam esse abdicant*.

adiuro: Amph. 889, *adiuret nolle esse dicta*; Hec. 268, *sancte adiurat non posse perdurare*; Men. 655.

adnuo: Bacch. 187, *ego autem venturum adnuo*; Curc. 342.

adsimulo: H. T. 358, *istunc exora ut suam esse adsimulet*; Hec. 235, *qui seis an ea causa me odisse adsimulaverit?*

aio: Amph. 387, *ego sum ille Sosia quem tu esse aiebas*; Capt. 365; And. 353, *ait tibi uxorem dare hodie*; 450; 470; 688; Merc. 637; H. T. 171; Eun. 315; 513; Phor. 315; 864; Hec. 238; Pacuv. 369, *insanam autem esse aiunt*.

arbitror: Amph. 908, *nihilo magis es, neque ego esse arbitror*; Bacch. 1131; Cas. 283; Hec. 215, *an, quia ruri esse soleo, nescire arbitramini?* Ad. 401.

aspicio: Cas. 228, tristem stare aspicio; Acc. 184, aspicio ex nemore pavidum egredi.

audio: Capt. 602, audin lapidem quaeritare? H. T. 181, huic filium seis esse? :: audiui esse; 731, audisti proxumam esse huic fundo ad dextram?

autumo: H. T. 19, neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat; Pacuv. 118, aut hic est aut hic adfore actutum autumo.

censeo: Asin. 385, nemo tetigit. :: at censebam attigisse; 338; 731; Bacch. 839; 904; Ad. 193, neque vendundam censeo, quae liberast.

cerno: Poen. 101, quia amare cernit.

clamito: And. 144, clamitans, comperisse.

clamo: Bacch. 284, cum mi ipsum nomen clamaret dempturum esse si quid crederem.

cognosco: Aul. 717, nam esse bonum cognosco; Eun. 226, ut non cognoscas eundem esse.

commemini: Cure. 710, non commemini dicere.

comminiscor: Hec. 333, aliquid tulisse comminiscuntur mali.

comperio: Phor. 801, cognatam comperi esse nobis; Hec. 779, si compererit crimine falso credidisse.

concriminator: M. G. 242, si concriminatus sit eam vidisse osculari.

confido: Capt. 696, si ille rebitet, sicut confido adfore.

confiteor: Cist. 741, confitemur cistellam habere.

constituo: Eun. 205, is hodie venturum ad me constituit domum; cf. Hec. 195.

credo: Amph. 469, illum mentiri sibi credet, neque credet huc profectum; 129; Bacch. 1129; 1138; Capt. 559; Cas. 271; 355; H. T. 881, ut nil credas intellegere; Eun. 118; 827; 858; Hec. 499; 617; Ad. 359; 518; 750.

cupio: Asin. 83, cupio esse quod det.

deiero: Cas. 670, deieravit occisurum eum; Lucil. 610, deierat non scripsisse et post non scripturum; Eun. 331.

denego: Men. 582, datum denegant quod datum est; H. T. 487, dare denegaritis.

dico: Amph. 345, iam faciam ut (sc. *me*) verum dicas dicere; Asin. 806, si forte velle dixerit; Aul. 108; And. 394, dic patri (sc. *te*) velle; H. T. 726, at quom (sc. *me*) venturam dixero; 768;

774; 866; Phor. 627; Hec. 76; 434; 550; Ad. 151; Enn. Frag. 479; Lucil. 22.

diffido: Cato, Agr. 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

dissimulo: Epid. 238, dissimulabam earum operam sermoni dare.

duco: Hec. 343, qui amat quoi odio est bis facere stulte duco.

edico: H. T. 626, meministin te edicere, si puellam parerem, nolle tolli.

existumo: Amph. 330, vix incedo inanis, ne ire posse cum onere existumes; Ad. 270, coram te laudare, ne id adsentandi facere existumes.

exporior: Trin. 460, benigniorem te mihi, quam nunc exporior esse, confido fore; Hec. 489, amo et desidero, nam fuisse miro ingenio expertus sum.

expeto: Enn. Trag. 379, quem quisque odit periisse expetit; Pacuv. 206.

fama: Hec. 775, famae (me) solam id fecisse.

fateor: Asin. 566, fateor esse vera; Bacch. 1013; Epid. 703; Rud. 1358; And. 14, in Andriam fatetur transtulisse; Ad. 77.

tingo: Trag. Incert. 247, finge advenam esse.

gaudeo: Epid. 7, venire salvom gaudeo; M. G. 897; Most. 1147; H. T. 407, salvom venisse gaudeo; Hec. 353.

gratiam habeo: Phor. 54, amo te et non neclexisse habeo gratiam.

impero: And. 842, animo otioso (eos) esse impero; Eun. 252, imperavi mihi omnia adsentari; Acc. 385, (milites) signa canere ac tela ob moenia offerre imperant; Trag. Incert. 89, solvere imperat secundo rumore.

induco animum: And. 883, quom ita animum induxisti tuom, quod cuperes aliquo pacto efficiundum tibi.

induco: Amph. 914, periclitatus sum animum tuom quid faceres et quo pacto id ferre induceres (in a different sense from And. 883).

inspecto: Poen. 710, egredere ut inspectes aurum lenoni dare.

intellego: Aul. 648, ut ne (sc. te) apstulisse intellegam; Most. 278; Pseud. 459; Vid. 34; And. 517, quom intellexeras id consilium capere; H. T. 979; Hec. 413; 657.

itero: Trin. 832, fidus fuisti; infidum esse iterant; Pacuv. 370, caecam esse iterant.

iubeo: Asin. 526, (eum) accersi iubes; Cist. 592, vir si veniet,

iube opperiri; 618; Epid. 69; Men. 225, cocta sunt; iube ire accubitum; 776; Merc. 777; M. G. 70; 1268; 1278; Most. 377; 420; 752; Pers. 269; 303; 314; 790; St. 248; 607; Truc. 585; And. 464, quod peperisset iussit tolli; 546; 741; 955; H. T. 775, et quidem iubebit posci; 1001; Eun. 262; 836; Phor. 409; 414; Hec. 185; Ad. 416; 429; 925.

iuro: Cist. 98, iuravit (se) me uxorem ducturum esse; Poen. 361; Rud. 1379; And. 728, si opus sit iurato mihi non adposuisse; Hec. 60; Cato, fr. (Jord.) 77, 6.

ius iurandum: Cato, Agr. 148, 2, ius iurandum dabit verum fecisse.

laetus sum: Eun. 392, ain tu, laetast? :: non tam ipso quidem dono, quam abs te datum esse; Phor. 820.

malo: Eun. 796, Pamphilam huc redde, nisi vi mavis eripi.

memini: Epid. 540b, quam memini comprimere; And. 428, ego illam vidi: virginem forma bona memini videri.

minor: Men. 842, minatur mihi oculos exurere; Stich. 21.

miror: Truc. 204, nondum advenisse admiror; H. T. 1001, miror non continuo abripi iusse.

nego: Cas. 573, si neget (animum) adesse; 583, negavit (se) posse; 698; Cist. 738, negat esse quod det; Epid. 227; Merc. 767; Most. 735; Poen. 105; Pseud. 119; 125; Stich. 256; 367; 393; And. 358, negat vidisse; 379; Phor. 459; 1014.

nolo: Bacch. 914 si non est, nolis esse; 1062; Men. 351; Trin. 979, dum ille ne sis quem ego esse nolo; 1170; H. T. 206, scortari (sc. filios suos) crebro nolunt; 627; Phor. 796.

nuntio: H. T. 892, nam ubi desponsam nuntiasti filio.

nuntius: Merc. 667, quoniam a viro ad me advenit nuntius rus non iturum.

obiecto: Merc. 411, mihi obiectent lenocinium facere.

opinor: Bacch. 12, Praenestinum opino esse; ita gloriosus erat; Cas. 858; And. 929, hercle opinor fuisse Phanium.

opto: Bacch. 724, bellus, atque ut esse optabam, locus.

pator: Acc. 365, pulsum patimini.

percipio: Curc. 159, ne quae hic agimus erus percipiat fieri.

polliceor: Men. 311, nummum illum quem mihi pollicitus dare; Most. 1086; And. 401, pollicitus sum suscepturum; 613; H. T. 724;

Hec. 751, pollicerer tibi segregatum habuisse a me Pamphilum;
Lucil. 213.

postulo: Rud. 941, nil habeo, ne tu mihi esse postules; 393.

praedico: And. 840, id facturas Davos praedixit mihi.

praedico: Acc. 615, ni vestitus, maestitudo praedicarent hominem esse.

prohibeo: H. T. 573, ea facere prohibet tua praesentia; Pacuv. 227, si ire conor, prohibet baetere.

promitto: Bacch. 920, quos dare promisi militi; Asin. 97; 529; 930; Cas. 288, Casinam promisi vilico nostro dare; Cist. 542; Men. 894; Rud. 777; Trin. 5.

puto: Bacch. 121; Curc. 557, quoi homini di sunt propitii ei non esse iratos puto; Poen. 1092; Phor. 21, quod adlatumst sibi esse rellatum putet; 1022.

renuntio: H. T. 661, quid renuntiavit? : fecisse id quod iusseram.

reor: Capt. 256, quom cavisse ratus est, saepe is cautor captus est; Epid. 485; Acc. 378.

repromitto: Curc. 667, ita repromisit, omne argentum reddere.

respondeo: Amph. 214, respondent se et suos tutari posse.

rumor: H. T. 16, quod rumores distulerunt malivoli, multas contaminasse Graecas.

scio: Amph. 22, scibat (vos) facturos; Cist. 588; Curc. 325; 331; Most. 953; Pers. 118; Stich. 336; And. 402, me obsecravit, qui se sciret non deserturum, ut darem; 976; H. T. 181; Hec. 641; Ad. 402.

scilicet: Asin. 787, scilicet facturam; Pseud. 1179; H. T. 856.

scribo: Eun. 10, scripsit causam dicere prius unde petitur.

sentio: Men. 481, quoniam sentio (eam) errare; Amph. 729; Hec. 638, sensit peperisse.

sino: Amph. 453, hanc nostram adire non sinam; Capt. 114; Cas. 472; Cist. 115; 453; Pers. 318; Poen. 373; 722; Pseud. 861; Hec. 565, edicam servis, ne ecferrī sinant; 853; Acc. 365.

spero: Stich. 71, spero ab eo impetrassere; Truc. 734; 753; And. 553, ut sperem posse avelli; 560; Hec. 147; Lucil. 456, deplocassere sperans.

spes: Men. 1102, spes mihi est vos inventurum fratres germanos; Stich. 387.

subigo: Truc. 783, vis subigit verum fateri.

suspikor: M. G. 401, suspicatus es eam vidisse osculantem.

video: Asin. 472, non vides irasci? Capt. 420; Men. 953; Pers. 642; Eun. 603, video esse; Lucil. 795.

videlicet: Asin. 599, esse interdus videlicet Solonem.

vinco: Most. 95, profecto esse vera vincam.

volo: Asin. 12, Asinariam volt esse; Cist. 506, quod dedi datum non vellem; Truc. 118; H. T. 322, vis quod des illi effici; Ad. 969; Com. Incert. 100; Lucil. 145.

voto: Truc. 901, manus votat priusquam penes sese habeat quicquam credere; Most. 869.

Dependent on the context: Trin. 102, te volturium vocant: hostisne an civis comedis parvi pendere; H. T. 605, orat ut det: post daturam.

Aequom censeo Type.

In a number of passages we have an infinitive with subject accusative used as object of a verb, accompanied by *aequom*, or some similar word standing in predicate relation to the object infinitive, e.g.

aequom censeo: Asin. 229, dic quid me aequom censes pro illa tibi dare! Aul. 597; Capt. 301; Epid. 552, tuae memoriae interpretari me aequom censes; Merc. 569, etiamst quod te facere aequom censeo; Trin. 304, meum animum tibi servitutem servire aequom censui; cf. Poen. 794, amicos consulam quo me modo suspendere aequom censeant, where *me* may serve both as subject and object; Cato, fr. Jord. 64, 6, vim in corpus liberum non aequom censuere adferri.

fas existumo: Asin. 514, neque id me facere fas existumo.

acceptum, sanctius, habeo: Most. 247, si acceptum sat habes tibi fore illum amicum sempiternum; Cato, fr. Jord. 59, 7, maiores sanctius habuere defendi pupillos quam clientem non fallere.

Passive Construction of Verbs Taking the Infinitive with Subject Accusative as Object.

A few verbs taking the infinitive with subject accusative in the active are found used personally in the passive with a dependent infinitive ('Nominativus cum Infinitivo'), e.g.

adducor: Afran. 290, adducor ferre humana humanitus.

arguo: Cato, fr. Jord. 24, 5, quod arguatur male facere voluisse.

dico: Asin. 382, ubi dicitur habitare; Men. 10, ubi factum dicitur; Pseud. 870, dicitur fecisse; Rud. 161, Herculis socius esse diceris; Truc. 84, is nunc dicitur venturus peregre; Asin. 313; Cist. 755; Frag. 73; Pacuv. 167, prius data est quam tibi dari dicta (*dico* = *promitto*); Acc. 530, in quos delatus locos dicitur; 535; Naev. Com. 2, dicitur geminum occidisse; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 230, quin appetisse dicamini; 233; Cato, Agr. 6, 4; fr. Jord. 15, 10.

digno: Acc. 474, cui dignabor dari?

existimo: Cato, Agr. Prooem., amplissime laudari existimabatur.

fero: Acc. 669, quorum genitor fertur esse ops gentibus.

invenio: Poen. 1171, ut haec inveniantur esse huius filiae.

itero: Acc. 3 (Baehrens), quae Cronia esse iterantur.

iubeo: Phor. 416, iussast dari; CIL, i, 198, 63, quo die iusei erant adesse.

monstro: Poen. 959, in hisce habitare monstratust regionibus.

renuntio: And. 499, quasi non tibi renuntiata sint haec sic fore.

perhibeo: Men. 408, qui perhibere natus esse in Sicilia; Pers. 202, nullus esse peior perhibetur; Stich. 25, esse aurei perhibentur; Trin. 692.

reperio: Cas. 1013, haec Casina huius reperietur filia esse.

subigo: Amph. 1143, mea vi subactast facere.

video (frequent): Aul. 803, esse in vado videtur; Amph. 303, iam pridem videtur factum; And. 757, adeon videmur vobis esse idonei in quibus sic inludatis? Eun. 454, audire vocem visa sum militis.

voto: Phor. 864, ait esse votitum accedere.

After the analogy of *dicor* we find *clueo* with the infinitive, e.g. Bacch. 925, Atridae cluent fecisse facinus maxumum; Acc. 533, unde ignis cluet mortalibus divisus; Enn. Praet. 1, esse cluebat miserrimus.

Except with *dicor* and *videor* the construction *Nominativus cum Infinitivo* is rare; with *videor* it occurs with great frequency, as it does in the classical period.

INFINITIVE (WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE) AS SUBJECT.

The infinitive with subject accusative is used as subject with a large variety of impersonal verbs, and with a few other expressions.

acceptum est: Merc. 655, si id fore ita sat animo acceptum est; Most. 224.

accidit: Amph. 171, quodquomque homini accidit lubere, posse retur.

adparet: Eun. 486, adparet servom hunc esse domini pauperis.

aegre est: Capt. 129, aegre est mi hunc facere quaestum carcerarium.

aequom est (60): Amph. 851, quid aequomst fieri? Bacch. 29; 398; 524; Capt. 259; Epid. 257, si aequom siet me plus sapere quam vos; Rud. 715; H. T. 203, huncine erat aequom ex illius more vivere? Eun. 42; Phor. 673; Hec. 868; Ad. 255; 675; Enn. Trag. 137; Titin. 134; Cato, Jord. 24, 14.

aequius est, videtur: Cas. 265, illum mi aequius est quam me illi concedere; Men. 1010, me perirest aequius; Merc. 549; M. G. 515; Rud. 269, aequius vos erat candidatas venire; 322; Stich. 97; 290; Trin. 119, ei rei operam dare te fuerat aequius; 1040, ubi malos mores adfigi fuerat aequius; M. G. 517, med expurgare haec tibi videtur aequius; Trin. 551.

aequissimum est: Rud. 1246, semper cavere hoc sapientis aequissimumst.

aliud est: Cato, Frag. 44, 4, aliud est properare, aliud est festinare.

auditum est: And. 534, ex te auditum qui aibant filiam meam nubere tuo gnato; with fut. force.

auguratum est: Acc. Praet. 38, auguratum est rem Romanam publicam summam fore.

bene est: Trin. 52, bene est illam valere.

certum est: Merc. 644, certumst ire me; Stich. 141, certumne est neutram persequi imperium patris? Eun. 704, iam satis certumst virginem vitiatam esse? Hec. 583, nunc tibi me certumst gratiam referre; Turp. 180, certum ac deliberatum est me illis obsequi; Enn. Ann. 143, 7, eorundem libertati me parcere certum est. In the Eunuchus passage, *certum est* is employed in the unusual sense of *constat*.

certa res est: Merc. 857, certa rest me usque quaerere illam.

certissimum est: Men. 1058, certissimumst mepte potius fieri servom.

clam me est: Hec. 577, non clam me est tibi me esse suspectam.

condecet: Truc. 227, meretricem similem sentis esse condecet.

conducit: Bacch. 764, non conducit huic sycophantiae senem tranquillum esse.

consentaneum est: Curc. 165, procul amantem abesse hau consentaneumst.

constat: Lucil. 172, unum concidisse senem constat.

convenit: Bacch. 659, vorsipellem frugi convenit esse hominem; Rud. 703, ignoscere his te convenit; Trin. 681, non convenit me in ditiis esse; H. T. 165, non convenit nunc me ipsum fugere; Eun. 494.

convicium est: Merc. 59, convicium (esse), me annos iam se pascere.

credibile est: Merc. 210, neque credibilest forma eximia mulierem eam me emisse matri.

cruciat: M. G. 617, quid est quod cruciat? :: me tibi facinora puerilia obicere.

curatum est: Bacch. 1067, curatum est esse te senem miserrimum.

decet: In many cases it is impossible to determine with certainty whether we have the infinitive with subject accusative, or whether the accusative depends upon *decet*. The following are the most certain illustrations of the infinitive with subject accusative: Amph. 35, iniusta a iustis impetrari non decet; 267, decet et facta moresque huius habere me similis; Asin. 81, me habere honorem decet; 833; Bacch. 640, hunc hominem decet auro expendi, huic decet statuam statui; Capt. 321, ne patri decere videatur magis me saturum servire; Cas. 230, non decet esse te tam tristem; Cist. 22, decet pol, mea Selenium, hunc esse ordinem benevolentis inter se; Curc. 332; Epid. 443; Men. 453; Poen. 1186; Pseud. 1225; Rud. 407; 702; Stich. 443; Trin. 548; And. 16, disputant contaminari non decere fabulas; H. T. 132; Hec. 252; Naev. Com. 22 ff.

decorum est: Asin. 508, an decorum est advorsari meis te praeceptis? 689; 701.

decretum est: Asin. 73, eos me decretumst persequi mores.

dictum est: And. 796, in hac habitasse platea dictumst Chrysidem.

difficile est: Trin. 620, difficilest reperiri amicum.

dignum est: M. G. 723, huic homini dignumst divitias esse et diu vitam dari; Trin. 1045; H. T. 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero.

disputet: Eun. 832, disputet sic mihi data esse verba.

dubium est: Hec. 326, perisse me haud dubium est.

evenit: Cist. 309, opportune evenit rediisse Alcesimarchum.

expedit: Afran. 278, ut scire possis ad quo te expediat loqui; Lucil. 543; Cato, Agr. 3, 2.

fallit: H. T. 514, me fefellit hosce id struere.

fas est: H. T. 149, nec fas esse ulla me voluptate frui; Bacch. 1025, nunc si me fas est opsecrare; Acc. 157.

flagitium est: Poen. 965, flagitiumst te pati; Ad. 102, non est flagitium adolescentulum scortari? 112.

fortasse: Epid. 296, xl fortasse eam posse emi minis; Merc. 782; Truc. 680, parasitum te fortasse dicere; Hec. 313, fortasse unum verbum inter eas iram hanc concivisse.

gaudio est: And. Alt. Ex. 13, mihi non minus est gaudio me reperisse.

gratum est: Capt. 414, te meminisse id gratum est mihi.

grave est: And. 566, istuc periculum in filia fieri grave est.

honestum est: Hec. 151, eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum est.

honestius est: Asin. 820, me honestiust hanc rem facere.

humanum est: Hec. 552, nonne ea dissimulare nos magis humanum est?

iniquom est: Scaurus, Meyer, p. 242, est enim iniquom apud alios me rationem vitae reddere.

inscitiast: Eun. 1071, vos non facere inscitiast.

iniurium est: Aul. 699, me illi irasci iniurium est; Hec. 73.

interest: Trin. 130, quid interest dare te in manus argentum amanti homini?

intermissum est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum scorta duci.

ita est: Aul. 688, si ita est, te compressisse virginem.

ius est: Pers. 106, pernam ius est adponi frigidam; Ad. 686.

licet: Cas. 706, redire me ut liceat; 89; Asin. 421; Pers. 291; 774; Pseud. 16; Trin. 21; Truc. 747; H. T. 401; 666, non licet hominem esse saepe ita ut volt; 672; Eun. 550; Hec. 11; 207; Afran. 118; CIL, i, 199, 5, quem agrum eos vendere heredemque sequi licet. The relative infrequency of this construction is in marked contrast with the common use of the infinitive without subject accusative in connection with *licet*; see below, p. 409.

lubet: And. 958, at mihi nunc sic esse hoc verum lubet.

longum est: And. 977, longum est illum me exspectare.

melius est (15): Amph. 664, redire meliust nos; Asin. 249; Cure. 417; Epid. 669; Men. 329; not in Terence.

in mentem est: Bacch. 161, *ecquid in mentem est tibi patrem tibi esse?*

in mentem venit: Aul. 228, *in mentem venit te bovem esse*; Bacch. 1193; Pers. 388; Plaut. Frag. 156; Phor. 652.

mirum est; mira videntur: Bacch. 179, *mirum est me te quaesere*; Cas. 259; M. G. 321; Men. 361, *mihi mira videntur te hic stare foris*; so Truc. 669.

mirabile est: H. T. 387, *vos esse istius modi et nos non esse haud mirabilest.*

miseria est: M. G. 68, *nimiast miseria nimis pulchrum esse hominem.*

miserum est: Epid. 136, *miserum est ingratum esse homini id quod facias bene.*

miseret: H. T. 750, *miseret me tantum devenisse ad eum mali.*

molestiae est: Rud. 830, *num molestiaest me adire ad illas?*

mos est: Capt. 198, *servitus si evenit, ei vos morigerari mos bonust*; Ad. 532.

necesse (necessus) est: Pseud. 995, *necesse est hodie Sicyoni me esse*; Truc. 222; And. 372, *quasi necessus sit te illam uxorem ducere*; Eun. 1075, *necesset multum accipere Thaidem*; Hec. 304, *nescio quid necesset evenisse*; Naev. Com. 106.

nefas est: Acc. 280, *petere a me id quod nefas sit concedi tibi.*

nihil est: Cas. 286, *nihil est me cupere factum.*

nimum est: Cato, Agr. 57, *eos non est nimum in annos singulos vini quadrantalia decem ebibere.*

nobile est: Trin. 828, *nobilest pauperibus te parcere solitum.*

nuntiatum est: Stich. 676, *quoniam nuntiatum est istarum venturos viros.*

officium: Trin. 174, *quid fuit officium meum me facere?*

operae pretium est: M. G. 31, *ne hercle operae pretium quidemst mihi te narrare.*

oportet (102):

a) Following the present. This is the commonest usage (85): Amph. 268, *me malum esse oportet atque hunc pellere*; Capt. 283, *id Orcum scire oportet*; Stich. 68, *pati nos oportet quod ille faciat*;

And. 786, hanc oportet abripi; H. T. 546, te adiutare oportet; Cato, Agr. 2, 7; Amph. 1031, prodigum te fuisse oportet in adulescentia, shows the perfect inf.

b) Following the perfect and imperfect.

1) The infinitive more commonly stands in the perfect, — probably as a result of the desire to emphasize the reference to the past: Amph. 740, te Iovi comprecata oportuit; Cas. 766, cenam iam esse coctam oportuit; Epid. 11, quam te iam diu perdidisse oportuit; Men. 194, si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abreptum; M. G. 1336, aurem admotam oportuit; Poen. 526, pridie nos te huc duxisse oportuit; Trin. 416; Truc. 510; And. 238, oportuit prae-scisse me; Eun. 981, oportuit rem praenarrasse me; Ad. 214; Stat. 9, gratulatum me oportebat (codd: *me oporteat*).

2) In the following instances we find the present infinitive with *oportuit*: Aul. 180, neque magister quem dividere argentum oportuit; Capt. 294, hic fecit hominem frugi ut facere oportuit; Eun. 1012, credere oportuit te; Phor. 70, regem me esse oportuit; Ad. 672, an sedere oportuit domi virginem? Cato, Agr. 2, 3, centones, cuculiones familiam oportuisse sibi sarcire; 2, 4; CIL, i, 200, 61, quantum numerum hominum in coloniam deduci oportuit licuitve.

optumum est: Turp. 56, quam legere te optumum esset.

opus est: Bacch. 988a, quid me tibi adesse opus est? Capt. 553; Merc. 917, non opus est intro te ire; Pseud. 1255; Stich. 81; 232; Phor. 560, opus est mihi Phormionem adiutorem dari; Hec. 409; Ad. 625; Naev. Sat. 66, quod sciri opus est.

par est: Amph. 832, quam me vereri et metuerest par maxime; Capt. 147; Bacch. 620; Pers. 800; Stich. 512; Trin. 230; Cure. 110b; Hec. 561, aderam quous consilio par fuerat ea prospici; 739; 867; Acc. 137, magis me par est tibi consulere et parcere.

par videtur: Amph. 493, deum non par videtur facere; 959.

patris est: And. 187, ea me exquirere iniqui patris est.

piaculum est: Truc. 223, piaculumst miserere nos hominum rei male gerentum.

perdoliscit: Acc. 317, nec perdoliscit fligi socios, morte campos contegi.

periculum est: Rud. 144, nullumst periculum te hinc ire inpransum domum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 33, 1.

peropus est: And. 265, nunc peropus est hunc cum ipsa loqui.

placet: Amph. 310, non placet me hoc noctis esse; Hec. 866.

placabilius est: Phor. 961, id nosmet indicare placabilius est; Ad. 608.

praestat: Bacch. 396, impendiosum praestat te quam ingratum dicier.

praestabilius: Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem quam haec ita esse me resciscere.

pravitas est: H. T. 973, quae istast pravitas id obesse huic!

prodest: Afran. 13, quid prodest istuc te blaterare!

prostibuli est: Cist. 331, nam meretricem adstare in via solam prostibuli est.

pulchrum est: Acc. 148, tropaeum ferre me a forti viro pulchrum est.

puDET: Bacch. 1007, pudet prodire me ad te in conspectum; 1155a; Epid. 168, quid est quod pudendum siet, genere gnatam bono ducere te uxorem! H. T. 260, quoniam nunc pudet me monuisse frustra neque eum potuisse me aspellere; Hec. 231, cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet? Ad. 690, si te mi ipsum puduit proloqui. Some other passages are taken by certain scholars as belonging under this category, but in these the accusative is best taken as depending directly upon *pudet*; see below, p. 411, and cf. above under *decet*, p. 391.

pudicitiaST: Stich. 100, pudicitiaST eos nos magnificare.

rectius est: Ad. 920, multo rectiust quam illam duci per viam.

refert: Bacch. 704, quid mi refert Chrysalo esse nomen? Cas. 529, quid me amare refert? Cure. 555; Epid. 116; 133; M. G. 882; Pseud. 1085; Truc. 394.

renuntiatum est: Aul. 604, eam renuntiatum est dari, with fut. force; Men. 1127.

sat est: Poen. 250, sat est istuc alios dicere nobis; Phor. 724, non satis est tuom te officium fecisse; Enn. Ann. 276, vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri.

satius est: Amph. 176, satius est me queri; 1017; Bacch. 395; Cas. 111; Cure. 266; Epid. 60; Merc. 656; Poen. 552; Trin. 311; Truc. 926; And. 307, quanto satius est te id dare operam! H. T. 969; Eun. 772; Hec. 730, ne quid faciam plus quod post me minus fecisse satius sit (perfect); Ad. 29.

scelus videtur: Merc. 209, scelus videtur me parenti proloqui mendacium.

servile est: Poen. 523, servile (*servuli*, *C*) esse duco festinantem currere.

spectatum est: Poen. 823, satis spectatum est deos eius negligere gratiam.

stabile est: Bacch. 520, stabilest me patri aurum reddere.

stultitia est: Cas. 282, stultitia est te esse tristem; 563; Pers. 798.

suavius est: Pers. 540, te de aliis quam alios de te suavius fieri doctos.

subolet: H. T. 899, ne subolat esse amicam hanc Cliniae.

susurratur: And. 779, iam susurrari audio civem Atticam esse hanc.

turpe est: Phor. 913, nunc viduam extrudi turpest.

utile est: H. T. 199, nam in metu esse hunc illist utile; Ad. 341.

veri simile est: Aul. 111, veri simile non est hominem pauperem pauxillum parvi facere.

videtur: Curc. 262, neque eum ad me adire neque me magni pendere visum est; Acc. Praet. 19, visum est pastorem ad me adpellere pecus lanigerum; CIL, i, 542, hoc dare sese visum animo suo.

volup est: Rud. 892, volup est me his mulierculis auxilium tetulisse.

Infinitive as Subject with Subject Accusative Understood.

With many verbs and expressions already enumerated as taking the infinitive with subject accusative, we find at times also the infinitive with subject accusative understood. The following are examples of this usage:

addecet: Bacch. 128, (te) mutum esse addecet; Pseud. 568.

aequom est: Stich. 131, non aequomst (nos) abduci; 548; Phor. 450, quod te absente hic filius egit, restitui in integrum aequomst.

certum est: Men. 977, bonum (me) esse certumst.

condecet: Aul. 590, qui ero ex sententia servire servos postulat, in erum matura condecet capessere.

convenit: Acc. 193, cuius sit vita indecoris, mortem fugere turpem haut convenit.

decet: Amph. 836, quae non deliquit, decet audacem esse; Men. 88; Pseud. 1127.

fortasse: Poen. 1004, fortasse medicos nos esse arbitrarier.

iniquom est: Hec. 740, insecitum (me) offerre iniuriam tibi iniquom est.

melius est: Rud. 141 (te) iubere meliust prandium ornari domi.

mirandum est: Capt. 158, non mirandum est (eos) fugitare hanc provinciam.

mirum est: M. G. 354, totiens (te) monere mirumst; 922.

necesse est: Cist. 46, necessest quo tu me modo voles esse, ita esse; Asin. 217.

oportet (frequently): Amph. 322, atque hau longe abesse oportet; 944, primum (te) cavisse oportuit; Aul. 754, non (eam) attactam oportuit; 757; Bacch. 400; 819; Cas. 571; Cist. 584, at non missam oportuit; Epid. 270; Men. 995; M. G. 47; Pers. 273; Rud. 1385; Stich. 112; 130; 726; Trin. 1092, visne aquam petam? :: res quom animam agebat, tum esse offusam oportuit; And. 239, nonne prius communicatum oportuit; H. T. 635, interemptam (eam) oportuit; Ad. 659.

optumum est: Truc. 626, iam te conficiam; (te) occidi optumum est.

opus est: Most. 287, quid opust, quod suom esse nolit, (id) ei ultro ostentariet?

suavius est: Bacch. 1045, si plus perdundum sit, (id) periisse suaviust quam, etc.

superbum est: Hec. 155, reddi (eam) patri, quoi nil dicas viti, superbumst.

volup est: Phor. 610, (te) venire salvom volup est.

vostrum est: Poen. 572, hau vostrumst (vos) iracundos esse.

INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS AN APPOSITIVE.

The infinitive with subject accusative (occasionally understood) is also used with considerable freedom as an appositive, especially after *hoc*, *haec*, *id*, *istuc*, *istaec*; occasionally with certain other pronouns, and a few nouns. But it is to be noted that this usage is confined to sentences containing some verb or expression which regularly takes the construction of the infinitive with subject accusative, so that while the infinitive in the following examples is not directly

dependent upon a governing verb, yet, as a rule, its appositional use is undoubtedly partly due to the presence of such verb.

hoc: Asin. 407, quid hoc sit, neminem meum dictum magni facere? Aul. 128, hoc cogitato tibi proxumam me esse; 226, venit hoc mi in mentem, ted esse divitem; Bacch. 1099, hoc est demum quod percrucior, me ludificari; Capt. 61 (iniquom est); 701 (aegre est); Cist. 774 (fabulor); Merc. 243; M. G. 1349 (vitio vortat); Pseud. 642, hoc scio, febrim tibi esse; Rud. 22 (in animum inducunt); 187, hoc deo complacitumst, med in incertas regiones eiectam; Stich. 11 (crucior); Trin. 793 (dico); 1132 (miror); And. 409, crede hoc mihi, numquam tecum commutaturum patrem unum verbum; Eun. 199 (scio); 660 (suspicio); 766 (dico); 857; 1069 (credo); Hec. 155 (cognosco); Ad. 272 (dolet); Ad. 803; Lucil. 435 (video); the phrase *hoc unum* occurs with *scio* in Most. 72; And. 281; 506; Eun. 877. In a few of the above examples, the subject acc. of the appositive is understood. Sometimes *hoc* is attracted to the gender of a predicate noun, e.g. Epid. 431, haec stultitiast me illi vitio vortere quod factitavi; Stich. 729.

haec (plu.): Merc. 797, Demiphoni haec eloquar, me istanc protracturum esse in viam; Ad. 964.

id: Amph. 561, praedicare id, domi te esse; Bacch. 98 (flagitium est); Capt. 195 (volo); 564 (planum est); Cas. 429 (aegre est); M. G. 475 (palam est); Rud. 397, id maestast sibi evenisse inopiam; 1201 (miror); Stich. 446; And. 180, id voluit, nos duci falso gaudio; 671 (puto); 811 (facile est); 835 (utilest); H. T. 324; 471 (subsensio); 922 (flagitium est); Eun. 724 (dico); 998 (gaudeo); Phor. 906 (nuntio); Hec. 476 (testor); Ad. 682 (dolet); M. G. 683.

istuc: Capt. 638, satin istuc exquisitum est, fuisse hunc servom in Alide? Merc. 985 (ius est); M. G. 1321 (crucior); Pseud. 313; Stich. 718, haud tuom istuc est te vereri; H. T. 1028.

istaec: Pseud. 430, istaec quae tibi renuntiantur, filium te velle argento circumducere; Merc. 764, palam istaec fiunt te me odisse; attraction, M. G. 878, stultitia istaec sit, me ire in opus alienum.

illud: H. T. 422, illud falsumst, diem adimere aegritudinem hominibus. With attraction: M. G. 703, illa laus est, liberos hominem educare.

quod: Acc. 206, quod esse arbitror periculum, misceri genus.

aliquid: M. G. 1067, quin respondes aliquid, aut facturum aut non facturum (with subject acc. *te* understood)?

With nouns:

audacia: Pseud. 1298, quae istaec audacia, te sic cum corolla ebrium ingredi?

causa: Hec. 677, hanc ubi dixti causam, te propter tuam matrem non posse habere uxorem.

facinus: Acc. Praet. 26, contueri mirificum facinus, orbem flammis solis linquere cursu.

factum: Capt. 684, erit mi hoc factum memorabile me meum erum fecisse liberum.

fama: Trin. 689, ne mi hanc famam differant, me meam sororem dedisse.

fallacia: And. 220 ff., fingunt quandam fallaciam, civem Atticam esse hanc.

opus: Cato, Agr. 2, 3, quae opera fieri potuerint, dolia lavari, frumentum transferri, stercus efferri, etc.

res: Bacch. 770, illaec res est magnae divitiae mihi, superfluis Chrysalum; Cist. 102.

responsum: Phor. 16, responsum hoc habeat, in medio omnibus palmam esse positam.

unum: Merc. 266, unum scio, me periisse.

verbum: Merc. 771, verum illud verbum esse experior: aliquid mali esse propter vicinum malum.

INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS PREDICATE.

The only instance I have noted is: Merc. 620, istucine est operam dare bonum sodalem!

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE.

As OBJECT.

This use occurs with the following verbs and expressions:

A. Denoting Another Action of the Same Subject.

abnuo: Enn. Ann. 193, certare abnuo.

abstineo: Cure. 180, dum mihi abstineant invidere.

adfecto: Bacch. 377, quibus patrem et me adfectas ad probrum appellere.

adgredior: Enn. Ann. 438, adgretus fari; cf. Paulus, p. 5, Th.,
pro eo quod est adgressus ponitur.

adorno: Epid. 690, tragulam in te inicere adornat.

adpeto: Turp. 159, oculi adpetunt cupide intui.

adsimulo: Cist. 96, adsimulare amare oportet; Trag. Incert. 57.

adsuetus: Asin. 887, ire adsuetum.

agito: Rud. 936, magnas res agito in mentem instruere.

apparo: Asin. 434, delenire apparas.

attendo (=persevero): Acc. 279, ne attenderis petere a me!

audeo (very frequent): Aul. 663, non audebit abstrudere; And.
505; H. T. 156; Eun. 619; Phor. 758.

calleo: Pacuv. 75, callent dominum imperia metuere.

caveo: Cato, Agr. 20, 1, eo plumbum effundere caveat.

cerno: Lucil. 160, praesidium castris educere crevit; 332.

certo: Enn. Ann. 304, 3, fluctus extollere certant.

cesso (frequent): Trin. 1135, quid ego cesso hos conloqui? Curc.
672; Epid. 342; Pers. 197; And. 846; Eun. 265; Phor. 252.

coepi (very frequent): Epid. 248, coepi ad illas accedere; Men. 483;
H. T. 97; Eun. 116; *coeptus sum*: Men. 718, itaque coepta appellari
est Canes.

cogito: Amph. 319, me quasi murenam exossare cogitat; Merc.
316; Poen. 1419; Pseud. 475; H. T. 607, quid nunc facere cogitas?
Eun. 777; 897; Afran. 46; Cato, Agr. 1, 1; 3, 1 (bis).

commemini: Curc. 710, non commemini dicere; M. G. 645.

comparo: Titin. 57, ut cum ea comparemus conloqui.

comperco: Poen. 350, comperce me attrectare.

compesco: Bacch. 463, compesce in illum dicere iniuste!

concesso: Poen. 219, numquam concessamus lavari.

condisco: Curc. 161, merum condidicit bibere; 534; Poen. 514;
Pseud. 945.

conor: Trin. 1150, quod conatus sum agere; Asin. 213; Capt. 62;
Enn. Trag. 5; Pacuv. 65; 227; Afran. 47; Lucil. 796; 862; Val.
Aed. 1.

constituo: Phor. 676, mihi dotem iam constituerunt dare.

consuesco: Pers. 170, mandata non consuevi simul bibere; *consue-*
tus: Aul. 637, id quidem te datare consuetum; Pacuv. 261.

cuncto: Acc. 72, cunctant subferre laborem.

cupio (very frequent) : Curc. 590, cupio dare mercedem ; Aul. 771 ; Truc. 185 ; H. T. 449 ; Eun. 145 ; 561 ; Enn. Ann. 170.

cupido : Enn. Trag. 216, cupido cepit me proloqui caelo Medeai miserias.

curo : Lucil. 423, Persium non curo legere ; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, uti cures lustrare.

cura : Enn. Ann. 90, ingens cura mis cum concordibus aequiperare.

debeo : Amph. 39, debetis velle quae velimus ; Pers. 160.

decerno : And. 219, quidquid peperisset, decreverunt tollere ; Lucil. 37.

defetiscor : Phor. 589, neque defetiscar usque adeo experirier.

depropero : Poen. 321, deproperant sacrificare.

desino : Men. 122, virum observare desines ; Aul. 523 ; Bacch. 100 ; 439 ; Men. 405 ; Pseud. 307 ; And. 22 ; H. T. 879 ; Eun. 16 ; Hec. 810.

desisto : Bacch. 1171, ut desistas ire oppugnatum ; Cist. 582 ; Men. 245 ; Rud. 682 ; Trin. 1012 ; And. 660 ; Hec. 105 ; Acc. 172.

digno : Pacuv. 166, quom neque me aspicere aequales dignarent ; 212 ; Acc. 447.

disco (16) : Amph. 687, didici dicere ; Cas. 362 ; Merc. 147 ; 508 ; Trin. 631 ; Ad. 125, pater esse disce ab illis qui sciunt ; Afran. 255 ; 283.

do operam : Hec. 553, quam dare operam id scire.

dubito : Epid. 260, quid istuc dubitas dicere ? Bacch. 1117 ; M. G. 1008 ; Poen. 789 ; Pseud. 625 ; 1313 ; Acc. 294 ; 360 ; Com. Incert. 36.

duro : Truc. 326, non quis parumper durare opperirier ?

enitor : And. 596, gnatum mi corrigere enitere !

exanclor : Acc. 269, ferre exanclavimus tyranni saevom ingenium.

exopto : And. 20, quorum aemulari exoptat nelegentiam.

exordior : Hec. 362, unde exordiar narrare.

experior : Capt. 425, magis non factum possum velle quam opera experiar persequi ; Phor. 538 ; Lucil. 705.

expeto : Aul. 652, audire expetis ; Asin. 27 ; Cas. 184 ; 669 ; Cist. 554 ; Curc. 107 ; M. G. 1258 ; Poen. 1131 ; Pseud. 1087 ; Rud. 240 ; 917 ; Trin. 674 ; H. T. 890.

exsequor : Asin. 160, te tractare exsequor ; Merc. 913.

fatiscor : Pacuv. 154, numquam fatiscar facere quod quibo boni.

faveo (= *volo*) : Enn. Ann. 256, moeros complent spectare faventes.

formido: Pseud. 316, si isti formidas credere.

fugito: Hec. 776, quod aliae meretrices facere fugitant.

gaudeo: Acc. 32, omnes gaudent facere recte; Ad. 254.

gestio: Cas. 471, iam osculari gestio; Men. 486; M. G. 8; 1398; Pseud. 116; 1073; Lucil. 699.

incipio: Asin. 448, incipit tinnire; Rud. 462; Truc. 465; 467; And. 493; 821; H. T. 495; Enn. Trag. 231; Acc. 368.

incepto: Cure. 24, numquid facis aut inceptas facinus facere? Trin. 1030.

incipisso: Capt. 802, quid hic homo incipissit facere? Trin. 884.

induco animum: Bacch. 1191, facere inducam animum; And. 834; Eun. 490; Hec. 99.

induco in animum: Hec. 603, non tute incommodam rem in animum induces pati?

infit: Asin. 343, infit percontarier; Bacch. 265; Aul. 318; Merc. 249; Rud. 51; 53.

immemor est (= *obliviscitur*): Pseud. 1104, qui officium facere immemor est.

insisto: Capt. 584, vide ne quid huic insistas credere! Phor. 192; Hec. 381, hanc habere orationem institit; Acc. 134; 428; Trag. Incert. 57; Afran. 81.

insto: Pacuv. 249, Spartam reportare instat.

instituo: Bacch. 1082, ego dare me meo gnato institui; Eun. 19; Ad. 38.

insuesco: Capt. 306, qui imperare insueram; Ad. 55.

intendo: M. G. 380, pergin intendere hanc arguere?

laboro: Lucil. 270, labora discere!

lubido: Bacch. 416, est lubido homini suo animo opsequi; Epid. 97, qui lubidost male loqui? 240; Men. 83; Pers. 121; 188; Poen. 1322; Pseud. 552; Trin. 626; 865.

malo (16): Poen. 706, accipere tu non mavis quam ego dare; Pseud. 140; Stich. 700; Trin. 306; And. 332; H. T. 858; Phor. 658; Hec. 110; Enn. Trag. 222; Acc. 85.

meditor: Ad. 896, meditor esse affabilis, et bene procedit.

memini: Stich. 60, meministis petere cibum; qui minus meministis quod opus sit facere? Eun. 340, advocatus mi esse meminerit;

Bacch. 328. — *Memento*: Capt. 231, at scire memento; Epid. 658; Pseud. 1164.

metuo: Aul. 248, metuit congregiri; Most. 1125; Pseud. 304; Trin. 754; Truc. 353, quo intro ire metuas.

metus: Phor. 482, quantum metuist mihi videre patruom (= *metuo videre*).

minitor: Hec. 427, quod nunc minitare facere.

mitto: Aul. 651, scrutari mitto; And. 873, mitte male loqui! so also Pers. 207; And. 904, mitte orare! H. T. 900, mitto iam osculari.

neglego: Merc. 86, mea promissa non neglexit persequi; Most. 141, optigere eam neglegens fui; Amph. 586.

nego: Instances of the infinitive without subject accusative following *nego* are taken as illustrating the infinitive with subject accusative understood; see above p. 386.

nequeo (frequent): Poen. 848, nequivit propitiare Venerem; 1294; Bacch. 91; Capt. 592; Merc. 125; 253; H. T. 320; Eun. 181; 661; *nequitur, nequitum est*: Rud. 1064, ut nequitur comprimi! Frag. 109, retrahi nequitur; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi.

nescio ('know how'): Bacch. 581, fores pultare nescis; M. G. 880; Most. 606; Pers. 762; Ad. 77, fateatur nescire imperare liberis! 220; Enn. Trag. 183; Trag. Incert. 112; Stat. 143.

nil moror: Capt. 16, alieno (sc. *aere*) uti nil moror.

nolo (very frequent): Asin. 835, nolo metui; amari mavolo; Bacch. 1083; And. 155; Enn. Trag. 303; Naev. Com. 36; Afran. 310; Lucil. 145.

novi: Enn. Trag. 133, ut pro viribus tacere ac fabulari noveris; Cato (Jord.), 36, 9, ceteros sequi si norit.

obliscor: Most. 487, lucernam oblitus fueram exstinguere; Pers. 722; Poen. 118; Pseud. 171; Trin. 1137; And. 841, sum oblitus dicere; Naev. ap. Gell. i, 24, 2.

occepto: Men. 916, iam occeptat insanire; 934.

occipio (frequent): Amph. 107, amare occepit; Asin. 316; 590; Epid. 77; Stich. 579; And. 504, si quid tibi narrare occepi; Hec. 116; *occeptus sum*: Eun. 22, occeptast agi.

occullo: Pers. 493, est res quaedam quam occultabam tibi dicere.

occupo: Most. 566, sed occupabo adire; Poen. 320; Pseud. 921;

Rud. 248; Stich. 89; Enn. Trag. 140; Acc. 380, quem impetum occupemus facere in regem; 650; Titin. 145; Cato (Jord.), 24, 2.

odi: Amph. 900, inimicos semper osa sum optuerier; Capt. 66.

omitto: Merc. 624, flere omitte! Pers. 431; 642; Eun. 989, omitte de te dicere; Phor. 861.

optineo: M. G. 186, earumque artem et disciplinam optineat colere.

opto: Asin. 608, me morti dedere optas; Aul. 11; Hec. 651, hunc videre saepe optabamus diem.

ordior: Trin. 1136, namque hoc commodum orditur loqui.

parco: Bacch. 910, cave parsis in eum dicere! Epid. 464; Pers. 312; Hec. 282, hancine ego vitam parsi perdere! Cato, Agr. 1, 1.

parito: Merc. 649, illo quo nunc ire paritas.

paro: Enn. Ann. 320, sonitum dare voce parabant.

percupio: Asin. 76, percupio obsequi gnato meo.

pergo (frequent): Amph. 262, nunc pergam eri imperium exsequi et me domum capessere; Bacch. 570; Merc. 303; Trin. 162; Truc. 265; And. 522; H. T. 237; Phor. 194.

perpetro: Truc. 465, nisi id ecficere perpetrat.

persequor: Rud. 667, ingredi persequamur.

persevero: Stich. Arg. 1, quod perseverent peregrinantes pauperes sustinere fratres.

pervolo: Epid. 536, pervelim mercedem dare.

pigro: Acc. 294, cur proferre haec pigrem? Enn. Ann. 274, pigret scribendi ferre laborem. Cf. Acc. 32.

ploro: Aul. 308, aquam plorat profundere.

possum (very common): Amph. 147, videre poterit; Bacch. 27; M. G. 782; Pacuv. 100, potestur investigari; Enn. frag. 574, retrahi potestur. — *Potens*: Enn. Ann. 231, bellum tolerare potentes. Details as to the occurrence of *potis sum*, *potis*, *pote*, belong to the history of forms.

postulo (21): Amph. 789, nos delirantis facere postulat; Aul. 589; Cas. 963; Men. 794; 1080; M. G. 437; Most. 613; Pseud. 851; Rud. 709; And. 657, nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxorem dare; Eun. 61; Ad. 238; Enn. Sat. 479, qui postulat alterum frustrari; Cato, fr. Jord. 39, 12.

praefestino: Rud. 119, qui praefestinet praeloqui; Afr. 395.

praeopto: Capt. 687, meum me caput praeoptavisse ponere.

praetereo: Merc. 403, quod praeterii dicere.

propero (frequent): Aul. 181, properare propero; Bacch. 1049; Pers. 667; Phor. 436; 845.

queo (frequent): Bacch. 982, ad lacrimas coegi male dictis, quae quivi comminisci; Capt. 100; Merc. 588; Trin. 801; Truc. 326; And. 270; 277; H. T. 453; Phor. 498; Acc. 661, neque impelli quitus sum; Acc. Baehrens, p. 269, 18, unde omnia perdisci ac percipi queuntur; Hec. 572, nosci non quitast; Stat. 279, non sarciri quitur.

quiesco: Most. 1173, tu quiesce hanc rem modo petere.

remitto: And. 827, si cogites, remittas me onerare iniuriis.

scio ('know how'): Capt. 850, scis bene esse, si sit unde; Cure. 620; Epid. 505; Pers. 6; 645; 762; Pseud. 226; 745; Trin. 766; 769; H. T. 196, qui uti scit; Phor. 79; Cato, Agr. 5, 4; 143, 3.

simulo: Aul. 463, simulavit mittere; Cist. 96; Rud. 1399.

soleo (frequent): Bacch. 897, quod dici solet; Capt. 70; Cas. 466; H. T. 363; 371; 520; 548.

studeo (17): Amph. 182, referre studeant gratiam; Bacch. 1161; Poen. 818; And. 822; Hec. 265; Lucil. 103.

studium: Hec. 202, viris esse advorsas studiumst (= *advorsae esse student*).

sueo: Enn. Ann. 61, vi depugnare sues stolidi solida suent.

tempero: Poen. 22, dormire temperent; 33; 1036; Trag. Incert. 15(?).

tempto: Pacuv. 95, saxum temptans scandere.

teneo (= *abstineo*): Merc. 52, omnes tenerent (*timerent*, Ritschl) credere; (= *scio*): Bacch. 655, qui et bene facere et male tenet.

timeo: see under *teneo*.

vereor: Epid. 41, simul ire mecum veritust; M. G. 1168; Trin. 1149; And. 323, vereor dicere; 488; 936; Phor. 61; Ad. 269; Pacuv. 67, ut verear eloqui; Acc. 157, vereor plus quam fas est captivam hiscere.

volo (extremely common): Amph. 294, volt pallium detexere; 360; Asin. 67, volo amari; Poen. 661; Ad. 151; Enn. Ann. 55, 9; Lucil. 209. For the perfect infinitive used with the force of the present, see below under Tenses of the Infinitive (p. 427).

B.

To this second subdivision belong those cases in which the infinitive fulfils the function of an abstract noun: *Curc.* 28, *ita tuom conferto amare* (= *amorem*) *semper*; *Men.* 451, *qui primus commentus est contionem habere*; *Bacch.* 158, *hic vereri* (= *verecundiam*) *perdidit*; *Pers.* 224, *nihili facio scire* (= *scientiam*); *Poen.* 313, *ego amo hanc. :: at ego esse et bibere* ('eating and drinking') is also usually cited as an illustration of this use.

C. *Aequom censeo* Type.

In several passages we have an infinitive without subject accusative used as object, followed by *aequom*, or some similar word in predicate relation, e.g.

Merc. 117, *hau quisquam dignum habet decedere*; 132, *num quisquam adire dignum arbitratur*; *Ad.* 51, *non necesse habeo omnia pro meo iure agere*; *Acc.* 205, *qui non sat habuit coniugem inlexe in stuprum*; *Cato, Agr.* 1, 1, *ne satis habeas semel circumire*; *fr. Jord.* 24, 5, *ecquis est qui aequom censeat poenas dare*.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS SUBJECT.

The infinitive without subject accusative is employed with a large number of impersonal expressions. But there are few established types of usage. Apart from *addecet*, *aequom est*, *certum est*, *decet*, *decretum est*, *licet*, *lubet*, *melius est*, *necesse est*, *oportet*, *piget*, *pudet*, *satius est*, there are few expressions which are used with freedom in this construction. In fact, the large majority of expressions with which the construction appears occur but a single time.

addecet: *Amph.* 1004, *eius studio servire addecet*; *Cas.* 199; *Most.* 902; *Pers.* 835; *Poen.* 328; 1389; *Pseud.* 738; *Rud.* 112; 115; 1391; *Stich.* 518; *Trin.* 78; *Plaut. Frag.* 94; *Enn. Trag.* 257.

aequom est: *Amph.* 29, *mirari non est aequom*; *Bacch.* 924; 1017; *Cas.* 895; *Merc.* 81; *M. G.* 1071; *Pseud.* 269; *Hec.* 527; 620; 840.

amarum est: *Cist.* 68, *an amare occipere amarum est?*

amici est: *Lucil.* 428, *amici est bene praecipere*.

attinet: *Pers.* 701, *quid attinet non scire?*

bonum est: Curc. 176, bonum est pauxillum amare; Trin. 462; Cato, fr. Jord. 77, 2.

capital est: Lucil. 438, scimus capital esse irascier.

certa res est: Amph. 705, certa res hanc est obiurigare; Merc. 857; M. G. 267; 398; Most. 706; Trin. 270.

certum est (frequent): Asin. 247, adire certumst mihi; Amph. 265, certumst hominem eludere; Capt. 492; M. G. 303; Truc. 549; And. 311; H. T. 466; Eun. 269; Ad. 718; Lucil. 590.

commodum est: Phor. 1026, quibus est commodum ire.

commodius est: Phor. 603, commodius esse opinor duplici spe utier.

condecet: Turp. 127, etiam amplius apparare condecet; Poen. 305.

condicio: Stich. 118, utra siet condicio pensior virginemne an viduam habere.

conlubet: Amph. 858, qui illi conlubitum siet sic me insimulare; Merc. 258; Most. 295.

consilium est: M. G. 344, consilium est ita facere.

convenit: Merc. 551, rei tuae quaerendae convenit operam dare; Cato, Agr. 7, 1; Matius, 10 (Baehr), edulcare convenit vitam curasque acerbis gubernare; Acc. 193.

decet (frequent): Amph. 267, decet mores huius similis habere; Capt. 196; M. G. 40; 616; Most. 53; Poen. 1402; Truc. 182; Vid. 89; Eun. 789, omnia prius experiri decet; Ad. 506; Enn. Ann. 58; 157.

decretum est: Aul. 572, bibere decretumst; 574; Bacch. 516; Cist. 648; Merc. 1; M. G. 77; Most. 667; Stich. 218; Vid. 61; Cas. 94; H. T. 392; 465; Enn. Ann. 325.

delectat: Cato, fr. Jord. 3, 12, quos delectat populi Romani res gestas describere.

deliberatum est: Afran. 274, deliberatum est non tacere amplius (*me amplius*, Hermann).

difficile est: And. 211, quoi verba dare difficilest.

dignum est: Pseud. 1013, salutem scriptam dignumst dignis mittere.

disciplina est: H. T. 300, disciplina eis demunerarier ancillas.

dispuet: Bacch. 481, alia memorare quae vidi dispuet.

distaedet: Phor. 1011, cum hoc ipso distaedet loqui.

est: Curc. 177, totum insanum amare, hoc est, — quod meus erus

facit; Ad. 131, ambos curare propemodum reposcere illum est quem dedisti; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1, est interdum praestare mercaturis rem quaerere; 61, 1, quid est bene arare? Lucil. 176, salvere iubere salutem est mittere amico; Asellio, Peter, p. 109, scribere bellum initum, iterare, non praedicare quid senatus decreverit, id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere.

expedit: Capt. 54, expedit fabulae huic operam dare; H. T. 337, nil video quam ob rem accipere hunc mi expediat metum; 388; Hec. 57; Lucil. 482; Cato, Agr. 9.

facile est: Curc. 240, facile est miserum inridere; M. G. 917; Most. 411; 791; Poen. 871; 974; Ad. 862, id esse verum quoivis facilest noscere; Turp. 9.

facinus est: Trin. 23, amicum castigare inmoene est facinus.

fas est: Enn. Frag. 511, si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere quoiquam est.

fit: Trin. 1035, petere honorem pro flagitio more fit; so 1036.

flagitium est: Ad. 422, nam id nobis tam flagitiumst quam illa non facere quae modo dixi.

futilum est: Enn. Trag. 266, saeviter suspicionem ferre falsam futilum est.

hominis est: Ad. 734, simulare certe est hominis.

honestius est: Poen. 1232, nisi honestiust prehendi.

humanum est: Merc. 319, humanum amare est; humanum autem ignoscere est.

incidit: Phor. 157, utinam ne Phormioni id suadere in mentem incidisset.

incommodum est: Hec. 153, hoc proferre incommodum mi esse arbitror; 417.

iniurium est: Hec. 71, eandem iniuriumst esse omnibus; 72, iniurium autem est ulcisci advorsarios?

inscitia est: Curc. 185, male mereri de inmerente inscitiast; Acc. 215, id quod multi invideant inscitiast postulare.

insipientia est: Amph. 36, iusta ab iniustis petere insipientiast.

intermissum est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum esse, pergrae-cari, fidicinas ducere.

lepidum est: Cist. 313, lepidumst amare semper; Pers. 266; Eun. 1018, lepidum tibi visumst, nos inridere?

licet (very frequent): Amph. 388, ut liceat te alloqui; 393, nunc licet mihi loqui; Asin. 935; Aul. 565; Curc. 401; Most. 239; Pseud. 252; Trin. 1173; H. T. 21, licere id facere putat; Eun. 262; Cato, Agr. Prooem.; Lucil. 386. Apparently after this analogy, we find *licentia* with the inf. in Trin. 1034, scuta iacere fugereque hostis more habent licentiam.

liquet: Eun. 331, illum liquet mihi deierare his mensibus sex non vidisse.

lubet (frequent): Aul. 211, quod non lubeat proloqui; Bacch. 353; Cas. 262; Curc. 131; M. G. 826, qui lubitum est illi condormiscere? Stich. 698; And. 816, ipsam despoliare non lubet; Hec. 56; Ad. 445; 766; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; fr. Jord. 16, 16.

lucrum est: Ad. 216, pecuniam in loco neglegere maximum est lucrum; Phor. 61, ubi quid mihi lucri est te fallere?

malum: Trin. 673, insanum malumst in hospitium devorti ad Cupidinem.

melius est (frequent): Men. 802, melius sanam est mentem sumere; M. G. 292; 881; Pers. 346; Ad. 180, ante aedis non fecisse erit melius hic convicium; Acc. 267, melius pigrasse quam deproperasse est nefas; Lucil. 634.

meliusculum est: Curc. 489, meliusculum est monere.

meticulosa res est: Most. 1101, nescis quam meticulosa res sit ire ad iudicem.

matronae est: Most. 190, matronae est unum inservire amantem.

in mentem est, in mentem venit: Amph. 710, qui istuc in mentemst ex me percontarier? Trin. 77.

meum est: H. T. 549, non est mentiri meum; so also Lucil. 427.

mirum est: Phor. 848, num mirum aut novomst revocari?

miseria est: Pers. 238, certare tecum miseriast; Poen. 820; Truc. 745.

molestum est: M. G. 672, tibi tanto sumptui esse mihi molestumst.

mora est: Capt. 396, quae memini, mora est monerier.

mos est: Capt. 985, mos est hominibus oblivisci; Cato, fr. Jord. 83, 1, vestiri in foro honeste mos erat.

navorum est: Enn. Ann. 295, navorum imperium servare est induperantum.

necessarium est: Rud. 252, id necessarium est perpeti.

necesse est, necessus est, necessum est: Amph. 501, mihi necesse est ire; Men. 118; Trin. 144; H. T. 209, necesse est consilia consequi consimilia; Phor. 296; Enn. Trag. 340; Cist. 626; M. G. 1118; Stich. 219; Afran. 396; Scipio Min., Meyer, p. 212; Eun. 998, quia necessus fuit hoc facere.

nihil est: Capt. 344, nihil est ignotum ad illum mittere; Truc. 769; Eun. 641.

nostrum est: H. T. 578, nostrumst intellegere.

odio est: Most. 705, ire dormitum odios.

odiosum est: Bacch. 1152, quam odiosum est mortem amplexari!

officium est: Cas. 585, non matronarum officiumst viris alienis subblandirier; Truc. 435; And. 330, ne utiquam officium liberi esse hominis puto postulare.

onus est: Truc. 470, mulieri male facere melius onus est quam bene.

operae pretium est: Cas. 879, est operae pretium auribus accipere; Most. 842; Poen. 1174; And. 217, audire eorumst operae pretium audaciam; Enn. Ann. 345.

oportet (20), much less frequent than the use of *oportet* with subject accusative: Bacch. 477, itane oportet rem mandatam gerere amici? 759, iam bis bibisse oportuit; Cist. 96; Men. 167; Most. 801, id domum trahere oportet; Truc. 169, rapere otiose oportuit; 461, nullam rem oportet dolose adgredi; H. T. 636, interemptam oportuit, non simulare mortem; Phor. 242; 527, itane facere oportet? Afran. 319; Lucil. 761; Cist. 574, quoi illam dedisset exquisisse oportuit; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, bene nitere oportebit.

optimum est: Enn. Trag. 132, (ita) sapere opino esse optimum.

opus est: M. G. 636, quid opus nota noscere? Poen. 311; H. T. 578, utquomque opus sit opsequi.

opus ('task'): Most. 379, miserum est opus igitur demum fodere puteum; M. G. 682.

par est: Poen. 1396, quid mihi par facere sit; Rud. 675.

patris est: Hec. 529, neque arbitrari patris est aliter.

periculum est: Poen. 633, malo bene facere tantundemst periculum quantum bono male facere; Pseud. 1076; Cato, fr. Jord. 33, 2, arbitror rem publicam curare summum periculum esse.

pericli est: Asin. 898, quid pericli sit vitium dicere; And. 867, erum quid sit pericli fallere.

perlubet: Capt. 833, perlubet hunc hominem conloqui; Rud. 353.

persuasum est: Bacch. 1016, persuasumst facere.

piaculum est: Enn. Trag. 286, palam muttire plebeio piaculum est.

piget: Aul. 210, ne id te pigeat proloqui; Most. 415; Rud. 634; Trin. 348; Truc. 528; Pacuv. 44; 144; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, eos pigeat vendidisse.

praestat: Capt. 327, est ubi damnum praestet facere quam lucrum; Trin. 345.

praestabilius est: Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem!

principium est: Enn. Trag. 378, flagiti principium est nudare inter civis corpora.

probrum est: Acc. 149, vinci nullum est probrum.

in prolubio est: Naev. Com. 31, et volo et vereor et facere in prolubio est.

pudet: Amph. Frag. xvii, nilne te pudet in conspectum ingredi? Asin. 71; Cas. 897; Men. 708; M. G. 622; Most. 1154; Poen. 1301; Pseud. 282; Trin. 344; 787; H. T. 1041, pudet dicere verbum turpe; Hec. 231; Ad. 562; Pacuv. 144; Acc. 103; Com. Incert. 30; Afran. 272, me pudet aliquid sufferre Graece. Apparently after this analogy, we find:

pudor: Com. Inc. 60, pudor est eloqui.

pulchrum est: Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, dices pulchrum esse inimicos ulcisci.

quantum est: Pers. 595, quantum est adhibere hominem amicum!

quanti est: Eun. 791, quantist sapere!

quid est: H. T. 971, disce quid sit vivere!

recipitur ('the right is reserved'): Cato, Agr. 149, 2, bubus binis domino pascere recipitur.

refert: M. G. 809, sed quid meminisse id refert? Truc. 71; Phor. 646.

religio est: H. T. 228, nil esse mihi religioſt dicere.

restat: Phor. 85, restabat aliud nil nisi oculos pascere.

ridiculum est: H. T. 353, ridiculumst istuc me admonere.

saluti est: Capt. 555, quibus inſputari ſaluti fuit; Eun. 940.

sat est: Stich. 692, sat est servo homini modeste facere sumptum.
 satius est (12): Bacch. 151, vixisse nimio satiust quam vivere;
 Cist. 42; 662; H. T. 474, tibi perdere talentum satius est; Phor.
 956; Ad. 58; Acc. 472; Lucil. 448.

segnities est: Trin. 796, diem sermone terere segnities merast.

suave est: As. 642, vobis suave est fabulari; Truc. 342; H. T.
 482, ut non sit suave vivere.

scitum est: H. T. 210, scitumst periculum ex aliis facere;
 Phor. 821.

stultitia est: Stich. 139, stultitias venatum ducere invitas canes.

stultum est: Eun. 761, quod cavere possis stultum admittere est.
 taedet: Phor. 487, taedet iam audire eadem miliens.

tuom est: Poen. 573, nec tuom est amicis iniuste loqui; And.
 678.

usus est: Asin. 376, dico ut usust fieri; Hec. 327, non usus factost
 mihi hunc intro sequi.

utibile est: Phor. 690, quid minus utibile fuit quam hoc ulcus
 tangere?

utile esse: CIL, i, 201, 9, neque id vobis oetile esse facere.

verbum: Rud. 1321, miserum verbum est habuisse et nihil habere.

virtus est: Pers. 268, virtus est, ubi occasio admonet, dispicere.

vis est: Truc. 753, vis est experiri.

volup est: M. G. 277, te volup est convenisse.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, AS APPOSITIVE.

The infinitive without subject accusative occurs as an appositive,
 especially with pronouns, also with a few nouns, as follows:

hoc: Asin. 509, hocine est pietatem colere, matri imperium
 minuere! Aul. 235, hoc magnumst periculum, ab asinis ad boves
 transcendere; 587, hoc est servi facinus frugi, facere quod perse-
 quor; 593, hoc esse officium reor, retinere ad salutem, non impellere;
 Capt. 750, vis haec quidem est et trahi et trudi simul; Curc. 670,
 hoc volo, meam rem agere; Most. 1091; 1165, si hoc pudet, fecisse
 sumptum; Rud. 191; And. 675, hoc tibi debeo, conari noctisque et
 dies; Ad. 74, hoc patriumst, potius consuefacere filium sua sponte
 recte facere; Stat. 28; Lucil. 914.

illud : Trin. 259, illud est dulce, esse et bibere ; 809, lepida illast causa, dicere apud portitores inspectas esse.

id : Capt. 208, hau nos id deceat, fugitivos imitari ; Merc. 744, id habet pro cibo, videre, amplecti, osculari ; Pseud. 576, ea stultitiast, facinus magnum timido cordi credere ; Trin. 697 ; H. T. 49, eum esse quaestum in animum induxi maxumum, servire vostris commodis ; Phor. 768.

istuc : Cist. 78, matronae magis conducibile est istuc, unum amare ; Pseud. 448 ; H. T. 566, istaec contumeliast, hominem amicum recipere ad te ; Acc. 460.

facinus : Rud. 393, o facinus impudicum, servire postulare ; Phor. 613, facinus indignum, sic circumiri.

aequom : Stich. 559, aequom postulabat, accipere pro tibia.

opus : Cato, Agr. 2, 5, reliqua opera curare uti perficiantur : rationes putare, argentariam, frumentariam.

quaestus : Cist. 376, eum quaestum facio, nil promittere.

res : Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 9, 12, Gallia duas res persequitur, rem militarem et argute loqui.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, AS PREDICATE.

In this use the subject is regularly either a pronoun or another infinitive :

hoc : Asin. 509, hocinest pietatem colere ? Bacch. 1068, hoc est incepta efficere pulchre ; Merc. 355, hoccine est amare ? Ad. 707, hoc est patrem esse aut hoc est filium esse ?

id : Trin. 637, an id est sapere ? And. 896, si id peccare est ; H. T. 324, si id saperest.

illuc : Eun. 782, illuc est sapere.

istuc : Hec. 608, istuc sapere est ; Ad. 386.

Nouns : Cato, Agr. 61, 2, cetera cultura est multum sarire.

An infinitive stands as subject in this construction in the examples cited above, p. 407 f., under *est*, as exemplifying the use of the infinitive as subject.

USE OF THE IMPERSONAL INFINITIVE.

The infinitive used impersonally occurs both as subject and object ; also occasionally as an appositive.

AS OBJECT.

The impersonal infinitive as object is found after verbs like the following. The list is only partial and illustrative.

accipio: Cato, fr. Jord. 62, 6, accepi ei potius credendum esse.

aio: Cure. 679, argentariis male credi qui aiunt; And. 534, ex te auditum qui aibant.

autumo: H. T. 19, neque se pigere autumat.

arbitror: Aul. 757, oportere arbitror; Bacch. 385; Men. 985; Phor. 814, commodius esse arbitror; Hec. 153.

audio: And. 779, iam susurrari audio.

censeo: Cas. 411, tibi cavendum censeo; Men. 345; Rud. 407; 961a; And. 794, paulum interesse censes? H. T. 214; 462; Phor. 457; Pacuv. 85. In connection with *aequom* as predicate, Stich. 293, ad me adiri et supplicari mihi aequom censeo.

clamo: Ad. 91, clamant indignissime factum esse.

cogito: H. T. 239, non cogitas hinc longule esse?

confido: Amph. 935, confido fore; Capt. 171; Cist. 73; M. G. 941.

credo: M. G. 359, credo tibi esse pereundum; And. 699, ut ne per me stetisse credat; H. T. 560; Eun. 245; Phor. 855; Hec. 141; Ad. 58.

dico: Cure. 680, et bene et male credi dico; And. 205, neque tu dicas tibi non praedictum! H. T. 863.

disputo: And. 15, disputant non decere.

do fidem: Eun. 1060, do fidem futurum.

duco: Men. 981, in rem esse ducunt; Most. 814.

existumo: Most. 814, esse existumo humani ingeni; H. T. 30, ne pro se dictum existumet; Eun. 4; 5.

fateor: Bacch. 562, fateor factum; Hec. 838, factum fateor.

gaudeo: Cist. 15, ventum gaudeo.

glorior: H. T. 765, gloriare evenisse.

insto: Merc. 242, instare factum simia; And. 147, instat factum.

intellego: Capt. 766, intellego redauspicandum esse in catenas; Pers. 376; And. 4, aliter evenire intellegit; Eun. 883; Acc. 119.

invideo: Truc. 745, invidere alii bene esse.

invenio: Aul. 758, invenies oportere.

- iubeo: Stich. 598, iuben ad illum renuntiari?
- iudico: Epid. 707, factum iudico; M. G. 1435; Ad. 960, iudico esse aequom.
- malo: And. 427, omnis sibi malle melius esse quam alteri.
- nolo: Cas. 501, argento parci nolo; Pers. 358; 851; Pseud. 388, nolo bis iterari.
- opinor: Cas. 340, non opinor posse; Phor. 603, commodius esse opinor; Enn. Trag. 132.
- patior: Bacch. 464, stultus es qui male aegre patere dici; Pseud. 1135; Stich. 125; Trin. 352; 586.
- promitto: Asin. 97, promitto tibi non obfuturum.
- puto: Bacch. 1083, aequom esse puto; Amph. 172.
- renuntio: And. 508, renuntio futurum.
- reperio: Men. 683, numquam reperies factum.
- scio: Pers. 211, multi ita esse sciunt; H. T. 529; Phor. 588; Hec. 425; Lucil. 606.
- sentio: Capt. 381, recte convenisse sentio; Hec. 315, trepidari sentio et cursari; Lucil. 386.
- sino: Poen. 117, sinite transigi; Cato, Agr. 5, 2, inpune ne sinat esse.
- specto: Rud. 1249, spectavi is plaudier.
- spero: Men. 1094, spero fore; M. G. 1231; Truc. 189; H. T. 103, licere speras? Phor. 1025; Ad. 71.
- teneo: M. G. 780, ita esse teneo.
- video: Asin. 24, video necesse esse; Bacch. 559; 1209; Poen. 397; H. T. 1053.
- volo: Bacch. 83, ubi lepide voles esse tibi; Capt. 460; Most. 313; Pers. 578, iri hinc volo; Rud. 1035; Stich. 154, voli intervise; 187; 563; 673; And. 198, velle ostendi; Phor. 306; 855.

AS SUBJECT.

The impersonal infinitive occurs less frequently as subject than as object. It is found with the following expressions:

- aequom est: Poen. 490, credo, ut mi aequomst credier; Ad. 968.
- deceat: Curc. 352, neque diem deceat demorarier neque nocti nocerier; M. G. 737; Poen. 866.

desitum est: Most. 958, desitum est potarier.

inductum est: Cato, fr. Jord. 37, 22, inductum est male facere impoene, bene facere non impoene licere.

intermissum est: Most. 959, haud intermissum est bibi.

licet: Pers. 376, lubere tibi per me licere intellego; 377; 799.

melius est: Pseud. 1, meliust exsurgier.

miseria est: Truc. 745, invidere alii bene esse miseria est.

oportet: Merc. 724, dictum oportuit; 950, sic fieri oportet; Most. 1093, factum iam esse oportuit; Pers. 448, reditum oportuit; Stich. 354; H. T. 200, mansum oportuit; 562; Ad. 955; Com. Incert. 42, nec mulieri nec gremio credi oportet; Cato, fr. Jord. 62, 10, oportet credi.

optumum est: Asin. 908, invadi optumumst.

piget: Trin. 661, me piget parum te pudere.

potest: Pseud. 268, potest obsisti; Truc. 637, persuaderi potest; And. 691, quam facile potuerat quiesci! 699, si poterit fieri; 922; H. T. 279; Phor. 402, dici non potest; 640, non potuit melius pervenirier; 773; Hec. 90; Ad. 302, unde emergi non potest.

solet: Rud. 271, veniri solet.

With *desitum est*, *potest*, and *solet*, it is possible, and perhaps better, to regard the infinitive not as subject but rather as employed after the analogy of the regular personal use of the infinitive with these verbs.

IMPERSONAL INFINITIVE AS APPOSITIVE.

I have noted but a single instance of this: M. G. 915, hoc cogitato, facile esse navem facere.

INFINITIVE TO BE SUPPLIED FROM CONTEXT.

Expressions regularly taking the infinitive are found with some frequency with the accusative alone (either as subject or as object) where the infinitive can easily be supplied from the context, e.g. Asin. 82, quom me adiit, ut pudentem gnatum aequomst patrem (sc. adire); Bacch. 1159, cor stimulo foditur :: aequius coxendicem (sc. fodi); Capt. 619, audibis vera (sc. esse) quae nunc falsa opinare; Cas. 243, scio plus quam tu me arbitrare; Merc. 50, negitare me natum suom; M. G. 1273, viri armati istuc faciunt, ne mirere mulierem;

Pers. 286, tu te numquam speras (sc. fore); 834; Poen. 1090; 1115, vin eam videre? :: filias malo meas; Rud. 47, ut se aequom est (facere); 570; 311, quid agitis? :: ut piscatorem aequomst; 1010; 1033, equem novisti? :: oportet vicinos meos; 1074; 1075, si ille te comprimere solitust, hic noster nos non solet; 1091; 1413; Stich. 448, licet haec Athenis nobis (facere); 530; Trin. 306; 378; Truc. 775, egon tibi male dicam? :: tibi te mavelim; H. T. 156, nec credere ausus quae est aequom patri; 570; 949; Eun. 279; Phor. 113; 399, expedivi quibus me oportuit (sc. expedire); 447; Hec. 120, ille primo se negare (ducturum).

INFINITIVE DEPENDENT ON NOUNS.

In connection with the discussion of the infinitive with verbs, there were noted various nouns which took the infinitive after the analogy of related verbs, e.g. *rumor* (Hec. 39); *fama* (Hec. 775); *licentia* (Trin. 1034); *pudor* (Com. Incert. 60); so also *fides*, *spes*, and others. Different from the foregoing, in which the infinitive stands in relation of subject or object to the verbal idea involved in the noun, are the following instances, in most of which the infinitive seems to approach its primitive purpose function:

modus: Men. 233, quid modi futurumst illum quaerere?

occasio: Cure. 59, ut quaeque illi occasiost surrupere se ad me; Capt. 423, nunc adest occasio bene facta cumulare; Pers. 725, nunc est illa occasio inimicum ulcisci; Poen. 659, agere tuam rem occasiost; 1212, facere occasiost; Phor. 885, summa eludendi occasiost mihi nunc senes et Phaedriae curam adimere argentariam.

opera: Men. 244, operam praeterea numquam sumam quaerere; Aul. 341, domo aps te auferto, ne operam perdas poscere; Pseud. 1141, operam fac compendi quaerere.

tempus: Asin. 912, tempus est subducere hinc me; Most. 714, tempus nunc est senem adloqui; Acc. 290, datur tempus in castra reverti; with subject accusative: M. G. 1218, nunc nos tempus est malas peiores fieri; And. 631, ubist tempus promissa iam perfici; H. T. 168, sed ut diei tempus est, tempust (Bentley's addition) monere me hunc vicinum; Hec. 597, tempust me concedere; joined with *occasio* Men. 552, dum datur mi occasio tempusque abire.

THE INFINITIVE WITH ADJECTIVES.

I have noted the following instances of the occurrence of the infinitive with adjectives:

animatus: Truc. 966, si quis animatus facere.

defessus: Epid. 197, per omnem urbem quem sum defessus quaerere; 719, sumus defessi quaerere; Merc. 805, defessus sum urbem totam pervenarier.

aegrotus: Trin. 76, ut te videre audireque aegroti sient.

immortalis: M. G. 888, ea immortalis memoriae meminisse.

lentus: Lucil. 295, solvere nulli lentus.

occupatus: Merc. 288, non sum occupatus amico operam dare.

paratus: Phor. 427, paratus facere; Enn. Ann. 170, alter pugnare paratus; Acc. 434, paratus sum petere pestem.

With *paratus* the infinitive is clearly to be referred to the primitive purpose use. With *animatus* and *aegrotus* we may conceive that the construction has been influenced by the ideas of wishing and the opposite involved in these expressions. With the other adjectives the use is loose and its precise genesis is not clear. *Neglegens sum* (Most. 141) and *inmemor sum* (Pseud. 1104) have been classified above; with these the infinitive is used as object.

In Andria 337, the MSS. give nisi ea quae nil opus sunt scire. Fabricius changed *scire* to *sciri*, in which he is followed by recent editors. But there seems no warrant for the change; *scire* is loosely attached to *opus*, like *meminisse* to *immortalis* in M. G. 888.

INFINITIVE OF PURPOSE.

The primitive character of this use has already been explained above (p. 366). The following are the chief illustrations of its occurrence in Early Latin. The arrangement is according to the verbs after which the construction occurs.

apparo: Asin. 601, qui sese parere apparent huius legibus.

comparo: Eun. 48, an ita me comparem, non perpeti contumelias? Turp. 99, numquam unius me comparavi servire elegantiam.

curro: Asin. 910, ecquis currit pollictorem accersere?

recurro: Trin. 1015, recurre petere!

do: Pers. 821, bibere da! And. 484, quae iussi ei dari bibere;

Cato, Agr. 89, dato bibere; bibere dato; so 103; Titin. 78, date illi biber; Lucil. 170, da bibere.

eo: Bacch. 107, turbare qui huc it; Bacch. 354, ibit aurum arcescere; Most. 66, ire in Piraeum volo parare piscatum; Phor. 102, eamus visere; Hec. 189, it visere; 345, intro iit videre; Enn. frag. 534, ibant viere corollam.

exeo: Cas. 855, eximus ludos visere.

abeo: Bacch. 900, abivit aedem visere Minervae.

mitto: Cas. 688, hunc missa sum ludere; Pseud. 642, reddere hoc, non perdere erus me misit; Eun. 528, misit porro orare ut venirem; Cael. Antip. (Peter), 101, 6.

perrepto: Rud. 223, latebris perreptavi quaerere conservam.

proficiscor: Rud. 847, ad me profectu's ire.

progredior: Turp. 153, progredior foras visere quid hic tumulti.

venio: Bacch. 631, venerat aurum petere; Poen. 1175, qui eo visere venit; Rud. 94, venio visere; so Piso (Peter), 84, 4; Truc. 167, venis querimoniam referre.

voco: Truc. 547, vocatus sum ire.

HISTORICAL INFINITIVE.¹

Of the many explanations offered to account for the origin of this construction, none can be regarded as satisfactory. The earliest of these explanations goes back to classical times. Quintilian, viii, 6, 21, refers to older grammarians who explained Virgil, Aen. xi, 142, Arcades ad portas ruere, as the result of ellipsis. In ix, 3, 58, Quintilian is more explicit. Commenting on the words *stupere gaudio Graecus* occurring in a speech of Caelius, he adds: simul enim auditur 'coepit.' So Priscian, xviii, 48, sic ergo et apud nos cum imperfectum sit, 'dicere coepi' pro 'dicebam,' 'scribere coepi' pro 'scribebam'; per ellipsin verbi 'coepi' solent auctores proferre verba infinita, ut Terentius And. 146, 'ego illud sedulo negare factum.' Deest enim 'coepi'; 'negare' pro 'negabam.' Other verbs were sometimes understood besides *coepi*, e.g. Servius on Virg. Aen. x, 458, ire prior

¹ Mohr, De infinitivo historico, Halle, 1878; Jänicke, Jahrb. für Klass. Phil. 151, p. 134 ff.; Wackernagel, Verhandlungen der 39ten Philologenversammlung, p. 276 ff.; Wölfflin, Archiv für lat. Lexikog. x, 177 ff.; Wisén, ibid. xv, p. 282 ff.; Kretschmer, Glotta, ii, p. 270 ff.

Pallas, says: *subaudis voluit ire*. In more recent times this theory has been revived by Jänicke, op. cit. p. 134 ff. Jänicke rests his support largely on the fact that *coepe* with a dependent infinitive often precedes the historical infinitive. But as Kretschmer justly observes, op. cit. p. 272, between the failure to repeat *coepe* with successive infinitives and its complete omission there is a great difference. J. gives no explanation why *coepe* alone is thus omitted and why we do not find instances of the omission of other verbs. Kretschmer further points out that even if we supply *coepe* with the historical infinitive, there are many cases in which this fails to suit the context, e.g. Merc. 46, *obiurgare pater haec noctes et dies*; Virg. Aen. iv, 421, *solam nam perfidus ille te colere, arcanos etiam tibi credere sensus*; Ad. 863, *ille suam semper egit vitam in otio, in conviviiis, clemens, placidus nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus: sibi vixit; sibi sumptum fecit*.

The view of Wackernagel, op. cit. p. 276 ff., makes the historical infinitive originally an imperative infinitive (see above, p. 366). In support he cites the fact that in various Slavic languages the imperative itself is thus used in narration. The usage is supposed to have arisen by conceiving the occurrence as the execution of an order. Cf. Trin. 288, *quod manu non queunt tangere, tantum fas habent quo manus abstineant*; cetera *rape, trahe, fuge, late*, where the imperatives are equivalent to *rapunt, trahunt, fugiunt, latent*. So also Pseud. 137, *eo enim ingenio hi sunt flagritribae qui haec habent consilia: ubi data occasiost, rape, clepe, tene, harpaga, bibe, es, fuge*. Psychologically therefore there is no difficulty in the development assumed by Wackernagel. The real difficulty in the way of accepting his theory is the absence of evidence to show that Latin originally had the imperative infinitive, and the fact that the imperative itself did not in Latin (as in Slavic) become an instrument of historical narration.

Wisén, op. cit. p. 282 ff., explains the historical infinitive as by origin not an infinitive, but a perfect indicative, 3d plural (*amare* for *amavere*), which was erroneously identified with the infinitive. At the start this, of course, was equivalent only to *illi amaverunt*. Later it came to function as *ille amavit*, and (with subject expressed) as *ego amavi*. The usage also, according to Wisén, extended to

infinitives of other conjugations, *monere, dicere, audire*, including deponents, as *mirari, tueri*, etc. But a conclusive consideration against this theory is the fact that according to Wisén's hypothesis the historical infinitive should have aoristic value, whereas according to actual usage and the express testimony of Priscian, xviii, 48, it has the equivalence of the imperfect.

Kretschmer (op. cit. p. 277 ff.) suggests that the historical infinitive may have developed from some such loose descriptive use of the infinitive as we see in German and other modern languages, e.g. Goethe, *Egmont*, Clärchen's song:

Freudvoll und leidvoll, gedankenvoll sein;
Langen und bangen in schwebender Pein,
Himmelhoch jauchzend, zum Tode betrübt,
Glücklich allein ist die Seele die liebt.

Kretschmer cites similar passages from Middle High German and from various modern languages, but he fails to make clear how the transition could take place from achronistic descriptive infinitives of the kind he cites to narrative infinitives referring to the past.

Examples.

Amph. 229 (consonat terra, clamorem utrimque eferunt). imperator utrimque Iovi vota suscipere, hortari exercitum. (tum pro se quisque id quod quisque potest, edit, ferro ferit); 1112 (postquam pueros conspicatae, pergunt ad cunas). ego cunas recessim trahere; tantoque angues acrius persequi; Aul. 19 (coepi observare . . .). atque ille vero minus minusque impendio curare minusque me impertire honoribus. (ita a me factum est); Bacch. 289 (nostra navis solvitur). ubi portu eximus, homines remigio sequi. (quoniam sentio, navem statuimus); Merc. 46 (leno ut quidque poterat rapiebat domum). obiurgare pater haec, perfidiam lenonum expromere; interdum conloqui; abnuere, negitare me natum suum. conclamitare tota urbe, et praedicere; 240 (dicit capram uxoris dotem ambedisse). mihi illud videri mirum. instare factum simia atque hoc denique respondet . . . et coepit inridere me; ego enim lugere atque abductam illam aegre pati; Rud. 606 (ago cum illa nequid noceat meis popularibus). atque illa nimio iam fieri ferocior. (videtur mihi mini-

tarier): Trin. 836 (circumstabant navem venti), imbres atque procellae frangere malum, ruere antemnas, scindere vela; And. 62, sic vita erat: facile omnes perferre ac pati; cum quibus erat eis sese dedere; eorum studiis obsequi . . . (sapienter vitam instituit); 96, quom id mihi placebat, tum uno ore omnes omnia bona dicere et laudare fortunas meas. (Chremes ad me venit); 146 (venit ad me clamitans) . . . ego illud sedulo negare factum. (ille instat); 368, puerum inde abiens conveni: holera et pisciculos minutos ferre; H. T. 895, magis etiam instare; Eun. 401, rex te ergo in oculis gestare. :: vero: credere omnem exercitum . . . (tum me solum abducebat); invidere omnes mihi, mordere; ego non flocci pendere; illi invidere; 432, risu omnes qui aderant emoriri. (denique metuebant omnes me); 515 (iam tum erat suspicio). ipsa adcumbere mecum, mihi sese dare, sermonem quaerere. (huc evasit); 618 (militem rogat); ille continuo irasci, neque negare audere; Thais porro instare ut hominem invitet. (invitat). miles vero sibi putare adductum aemulum . . . miles tendere; Phor. 92 (intervenit adulescens quidam lacrumans). nos mirarier. (rogamus quid sit); 117 (negat). noster quid ageret nescire. (illam ducere cupiebat); Hec. 120, ille primo negare; 165, iniurias viri omnes ferre; 182, fugere e conspectu, videre nolle; 826, ille alias res agere se simulare; Ad. 44 (uxorem numquam habui). ille contra haec omnia: ruri agere vitam; semper parce se habere. (uxorem duxit); 864 (egit vitam in otio), nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus; (sibi vixit); Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 17, 3, compluriens eorum milites alteri alteros occidere, multi ad hostes transfugere, in imperatorem impetum facere; 58, 10, descendit de cantherio, inde staticulos dare, ridicularia fundere; Acc. 438, conlocat sese in locum celsum; hinc manibus rapere raudus saxeum grande et grave; Afran. 127, ego misera risu clandestino rumpier, torpere mater, amens ira fervere; Calpurn. Piso, Peter, p. 82, 9, L. Tarquinius, collegam suam, metuere eumque orat ut Roma concedat.

Most of the citations by Mohr from Lucilius and the fragments of the dramatists are too uncertain to warrant recognition as illustrations of this usage.

In one instance we have an interrogative historical infinitive: Eun. 391, magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?

An examination of the foregoing material substantiates fully the

conclusions of Wölfflin (op. cit. p. 180 ff.) that in Early Latin, reflexive uses are rare, that deponents occur with freedom, while the passive¹ does not yet appear. Wölfflin notes also that the historical infinitive rarely occurs accompanied by a subordinate clause (as in Bacch. 289). More commonly, too, we have a group of two or more infinitives. Instances where we have but one (e.g. Merc. 242; And. 146; H. T. 895; Acc. 438; Calp. Piso, 82, 9) are infrequent.

As already stated above (p. 421), the historical infinitive has the equivalence of the imperfect, not of the historical perfect. Hence momentary acts cannot be expressed by it. This explains the frequent shift from the historical infinitive to the historical perfect in the same sentence; see the above examples.

INFINITIVE IN EXCLAMATIONS.²

"From phrases like Bacch. 237, *nam meus formidat animus nostrum tam diu ibi desiderare neque redire filium*; Capt. 600, *crucior lapidem non habere me*; Asin. 407, *quid hoc sit negoti, neminem meum dictum magni facere?* 127, *sicine hoc fit, foras aedibus me eici?* it is but a step to the Infinitive of Exclamation, e.g. Pers. 42, *sicine hoc te mihi facere?*" (Lindsay, Syntax of Plautus, p. 75). To Lindsay's examples of origin may be added: Poen. 842, *haec quom video fieri, crucior*; *pretiis emptos maxumis apud nos expeculiatos servos fieri suis eris*, where one may well hesitate as to whether *servos fieri* depends upon *crucior* or is an infinitive of exclamation; Rud. 393, *o facinus impudicum! quam liberam esse oporteat servire postulare!* Hec. 547, *adeon me esse pervicacem censes?* (the origin perhaps of expressions like *adeon pervicaci esse animo*, in Hec. 532); Hec. 613, *quid vis? :: hinc abire matrem (sc. iubes)? minime!*

Infinitives of the type under consideration fall into two classes: 1) Without *-ne*; 2) With *-ne*. Whether the *-ne* in infinitives of the second class is interrogative, as is suggested above, or is intensive, as urged by Warren (American Journal of Philology, ii, p. 50 ff.), is uncertain.

¹ Afran. 127, *rumpier*, is middle.

² Kraz, Die sogenannte unwillige Frage mit dem Accusativ und Infinitiv, 1862; Gustav Müller, Ueber die sogenannten unwilligen Fragen, 1875.

A. INFINITIVES OF EXCLAMATION WITHOUT *-NE*.

1) Present Tense: Bacch. 66, penetrare huius modi in palae-
stram! 483, manum sub vestimenta ad corpus tetulit, neque pudere
quicquam! Cas. 89, non mihi licere meam loqui atque cogitare!
Curc. 623, servom antestari! Men. 1005, erum meum luci deripier
in via! Stich. 765, stantem stanti dare amicum amicae! And. 870,
tantum laborem capere! 879, adeo inpotenti esse animo! H. T. 401,
me non licere frui! 630, tantam esse inscitiam! Eun. 209, ah rogi-
tare, quasi difficile sit! Phor. 233, non simultatem meam revereri!
non pudere! 977, non hoc publicitus scelus hinc asportarier! 1042,
nil pudere! Naev. Com. 72, quae ego probavi, ea non audere quem-
quam regem rumpere! Eun. Trag. 47.

2) Perfect Tense: Asin. 580, edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum
fuisse! Bacch. 1102, hoc servom meum facere esse ausum! Capt.
945, vae misero mihi: propter meum caput labores homini evenisse!
783, ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi! Epid. 521, ei! sic data
esse verba! Merc. 785, sic me nuptam tam male! measque in aedis
sic scorta obductarier! H. T. 503, ita comparatam esse naturam
omnium! Phor. 503, tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum! 884, tantam
fortunam esse his datam! Hec. 227, non te pro his curasse rebus!
Ad. 562, non puduisse verberare senem! 629, non me hanc rem patri
indicasse! Cato, fr. Jord. 41, 9, iniurias te facere ausum esse!

B. INFINITIVES OF EXCLAMATION WITH *-NE*.

1) Present Tense: Bacch. 152, magistrum quemquam discipulum
minitarier! Curc. 200, hocine fieri ut inmodestis te moderes mori-
bus! 695, hocine pacto me abripi! M. G. 626, hancine aetatem exer-
cere mei amoris gratia! Pers. 42, sicine hoc te mi facere! Pseud.
202, huncine hominem pati colere iuventutem Atticam! Truc. 537,
hoccin mihi ob labores tantos tantillum dari! 933, huncine hominem
te amplexari! And. 245, adeon hominem esse invenustum! 253, tan-
tamne rem tam nelegenter agere! 425, nullane in re esse quoiquam
fidem! 689, sicine me sollicitari! 716, nilne esse proprium quoiquam!
H. T. 751, illancine mulierem alere! 921, tene istuc loqui! Eun. 225,
adeon homines inmutarier! 553, neminemne curiosum intervenire!
Phor. 339, tene asymbolum venire unctum! 497, adeon ingenio esse

duro te! 499, adeon te esse incogitantem! 810, itan parvam mihi fidem esse! 977, tantane adfectum quemquam esse hominem audacia! Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo! Ad. 38, vah! quemquamne hominem in animo instituere! 237, hocine incipere Aeschinum! 390, haecine fieri! 408, haecine flagitia facere te! haec te admittere; 610b, hocine mali obici tantum! Enn. Trag. 47, men obesse, illos prodesse; me obstare, illos obsequi! Cato, fr. Jord. 41, 5, eane fieri bonis! With *nonne*: Trin. 1046, nonne hoc publice animum advorti!

2) Perfect Tense: Asin. 226, haecine te esse oblitum; Bacch. 283, adeon me fuisse fungum, ut crederem! 628, criminin me habuisse fidem! 1090, hocine me aetatis ludos bis factum esse indigne! Curc. 589, sicine mihi esse os oblitum; M. G. 488, meamne hospitam tractatam et ludificatam! Pseud. 371, ten amatorem esse inventum inanem! Trin. 1017, tribusne te poteriis memoriam esse oblitum! And. 609, servon fortunas meas me commisisse! H. T. 980, adeon rem rediisse! so Phor. 153; Eun. 360, numquamne me illam vidisse! 644, hocine tam audax facinus facere esse ausum! Phor. 466, itane te hinc abisse et vitam tuam tutandam aliis dedisse! Ad. 449, ex illan familia tam inliberale facinus esse ortum! Pacuv. 40, men servasse, ut essent qui me perderent!

An examination of the foregoing material shows that the infinitive of exclamation is used almost exclusively in expressions of disgust, contempt, and regret. In only a single instance do we have an expression of satisfaction: Asin. 580, edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum fuisse! In Eun. 209, ah! rogitare, quasi difficile sit, the feeling is one of mild reproach.

It is noteworthy that Terence makes much freer use of the construction than Plautus. In the six plays of Terence there are nearly twice as many instances of the usage as in all the plays of Plautus.

INFINITIVE IN TITLES.

Here belong such uses as in Cato, Agr. 115, 2, vinum ad alvom movendam concinnare; 122, vinum concinnare, si lotium difficilius transibit; 128, habitationem delutare.

TENSES OF THE INFINITIVE.

PRESENT INFINITIVE.

Present for Future.

The use of the present infinitive with future force is somewhat common in Early Latin, especially with verbs whose meaning involves a reference to future time, as verbs of hoping, promising, swearing, vowing, threatening, etc. The usage is doubtless influenced by the free use of the present indicative with future force. The frequency with which the subject of the accusative is omitted in this use is noteworthy. Examples :

adiuro: Cist. 583, se adiurat mihi monstrare.

adnuo: Enn. Ann. 87, adnuvit sese mecum decernere ferro.

aio: Pseud. 1118, aibat arcessere; Capt. 586, quod redimere se ait; Asin. 442; And. 353, ait tibi uxorem dare hodie.

arbitror: Amph. 675, me meum officium facere, si huic eam advorsum, arbitror.

audio: And. 534, ex te auditum aibant filiam meam nubere tuo gnato.

autumo: Most. 1132, pro te ire autumo.

censeo: Aul. 528, aes censet dari.

denego: Stich. 558, denegavit dare se; H. T. 487, dare denegaris.

dico: Asin. 366, dixit sese operam dare; 394, ire dixit; Capt. 194, quo ire dixeram; Cas. 479, se locum dixit dare; Merc. 419; 467; M. G. 229; 231; Poen. 529; Trin. 736; And. 411, si te dices ducere; Eun. 793; Phor. 532; Ad. 203; Pacuv. 167.

interminor: Pseud. 778, interminatus est eum perbitere.

iuro: Rud. 1379, iuratust mihi dare; Poen. 361, liberare me iuravisti; Pers. 401.

minor: Stich. 21, quod facere minatur; Men. 842, minatur mihi oculos exurere.

nego: Cas. 698, negat ponere; Pers. 432, te negabas credere argentum mihi; Rud. 1292, ei dari negatis? Stich. 393; And. 379, si tu negaris ducere.

polliceor: Men. 311, pollicitus dare; Most. 1084; 1086; And. 613, qui sum pollicitus ducere.

promitto: Bacch. 920, quos dare promisi militi; so also 969a; Cas. 288; Cist. 542; Merc. 631, promittebas te os sublinere patri; Rud. 777, promissimus talentum sistere; Trin. 5.

repromitto: Cure. 667, repromisit reddere.

scio: Most. 17, te in pistrinum seis actutum tradier.

spero: Truc. 936, si hanc tecum esse speras; Rud. 636, ut esse speres virgidemiam; 589; Eun. 520, sperat se a me avellere; Hec. 147, sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

voveo: Cure. 72, me inferre vovi; 181, pervigilare te vovisti.

Dependent on context: Amph. 206, si velint rapta tradere, abituros agro, pacem dare illis.

The foregoing verbs also govern the future infinitive, as may be seen by the material cited at p. 367 ff.

WITH MEMINI.

Memini is regularly construed with the present infinitive of personal experience, as in the classical period. See the examples cited at p. 374 f.

USE OF THE PERFECT INFINITIVE.

Perfect Infinitive with Force of Present.

The perfect infinitive occurs with the force of the present, especially with verbs of wishing, and the perfect indicative of expressions having the force of 'it was fitting' (*oportuit, decuit, aequom fuit*, etc.). With expressions of the latter type, the perfect seems to be the result of a striving to bring out more clearly the reference to the past (Ziemer, *Junggrammatische Streifzüge*, p. 76). With verbs of wishing, it is possible that we have a survival of the aoristic force of the tense (Delbrück, *Vgl. Synt.* ii, p. 473).

aequom fuit: Bacch. 1017, prius cavisse ergo quam pudere aequom fuit; M. G. 730, itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit.

cupio: Asin. 901, perisse (eam) cupio.

decuit: Naev. Com. 22, suapte utrosque decuit acceptos cibo.

expeto: Hec. 727, me nunc conventam esse expetit; Pacuv. 206, me esse adiutam expetunt.

nolo: Poen. 872, noli devellisse (sc. alas).

operae pretium est: Most. 842, latius demumst operae pretium ivisse.

oportuit: Amph. 944, cavisse oportuit; Aul. 754, non attactam oportuit; Bacch. 759, iam bibisse oportuit; 819; Cas. 766, cenam iam esse coctam oportuit; Cist. 574, exquisisse oportuit; 584, at non missam oportuit; Epid. 11, quam te iam diu perdidisse oportuit; Men. 194, oportebat nasum abreptam mordicus; 995, iam sublimen raptum oportuit; M. G. 1336; Poen. 526; Stich. 130, non datas oportuit; Trin. 1092; Truc. 510, aliquid actum oportuit; Merc. 724, dictum oportuit; Most. 1093, factum oportuit; Pers. 448; Stich. 354; Trin. 416; And. 238, nonne oportuit praescisse me? nonne communicatum oportuit? H. T. 200, mansum tamen oportuit; 247, non oportuit relictas; 635; Eun. 981, oportuit rem praenarrasse me; Ad. 214, adulescenti morem gestum oportuit; Stat. 9, gratulatum med oportebat prius (MSS. me oporteat); Afran. 17.

opus est: Stich. 232, haec venisse iam opus est.

possum: Aul. 828, non potes probasse nugas; Merc. 596; iam a portu rediisse potuit.

volo: Poen. 1119, est qui illum conventam esse volt; Pseud. 905, si quemquam di voluere esse adiutum; 906, tum me et Calidorum servatum volunt esse et lenonem extinctum; Rud. 1193, si esse bene factum volunt; Stich. 127, esse ambas conventas volo; And. 510, opinionem hanc esse amotam volo; H. T. 978, rogasse vellem; Hec. 563, interdico ne extulisse extra aedes puerum velis! Cato, Agr. 5, 4, nequid emisse velit, neu quid dominum celavisse velit; haruspice ne consuluisse velit; fr. Jord. 47, 16, domi quom auspicamus, honorem me divom velim habuisse; CIL, 1, 196, 4, habuisse velet; so 11; 7, adiese velet; 12, fecisse velit; so 15, 16, 20; 13, coniourase, comvovise, conspondise, compromesise velet; 14, dedise velet; 21, arfuise velent.

Corresponding to the use of the perfect indicative of *sum* in the sense 'is no longer', 'has perished,' we find occasionally also the perfect infinitive similarly used: Capt. 243, di animum ostenderunt suum ut qui erum me tibi fuisse velint ('wish me no longer to be your master'); 516, me fuisse mavelim, 'I wish I were dead'; Bacch. 151, vixisse nimio satiust quam vivere.

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTICIPLES, GERUND, AND SUPINE, ETC.

PARTICIPLES.

The Present Active Participle.¹

THERE exists unfortunately a great confusion of nomenclature in treating of the different uses of the Latin participle. Some, as Gustafsson and Tammelin, divide all uses into appositive and predicative. Others, as Schmalz, *Synt.*, p. 453, recognize attributive and predicative uses. The latest work on the participle, that of Sidey, has nothing to say of either attributive or appositive uses, but classifies as follows: 1. Participles with true participial force; 2. Participles used predicatively, so that apparently a predicative use, as *Bacch.* 204, *exeuntem me aspexisti*, is not to be regarded as an illustration of a participle with true participial force. Various other grammarians omit all reference to attributive, appositive, and predicative uses.

Even among those who recognize predicative uses there is not entire agreement as to the definition of the term. Thus Schmalz, *Synt.*, p. 456, regards *Cist.* 123, *quae hinc flens abiit*, as an illustration of the predicate use (justly so in my judgment), while Tammelin brings it under another head. Yet when Schmalz brings under the predicative uses *Rud.* 71, *vehemens sum exoriens*; *Men.* 951, *at ego te pendentem fodiam stimulis*; *Amph.* 437, *iniurato plus credet mihi quam iurato tibi*; *Cas.* 510, *iam victi vicimus*, he is, I think, using the term at variance with the meaning attached to it by most investigators.

We may, I believe, with good reason distinguish three different general types of participial uses:

¹ Tammelin, *De participiis praeae Latinitatis*, 1889; Sidey, *The Participle in Plautus, Petronius, and Apuleius*, 1909; Schmalz, *Syntax und Stilistik* ⁴, p. 449 ff.

1. **The attributive use**, where the participle limits the substantive directly, as 'boiling water'; *aqua fervens*; 'kochendes Wasser.'

2. **The appositive use**, in which the relation of the participle to its substantive is analogous to that of a noun in the appositive relation, as *Marcus subito adveniēns me ibi invenit*; 'Marcus, suddenly arriving, found me there'; 'plötzlich ankommend fand er mich da.'

3. **The predicative use**, in which the main predication is found in the participle, as *flens abiit*; 'he departed weeping'; 'er ging weinend fort'; *rediit triumphans*; 'he returned in triumph'; 'er kehrte als Triumphator zurück.'

We shall have to consider also the participle used as adjective and as substantive.

ATTRIBUTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

The attributive use of the present participle is not frequent. Examples are: Bacch. 478, ut in gremio osculantem mulierem teneat sedens; Liv. And. Trag. 26, ego puerum ancillae subdam lactantem meae; Enn. Trag. 30, lunata micans Diana facem iacit a laeva; 316, neque sanguis ullo potis pacto profluens consistere; Acc. 397, vel globosos turbines exsistere ictos undis concursantibus; 401, undante in freto; Stat. 214, ab amico amante argentum accipere meretrix non volt; Enn. Ann. 194, 13, suavis homo, facundus . . . secunda loquens in tempore . . . multa tenens antiqua sepulta; 200, pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis; 231, milia militum octo duxit delectos, bellum tolerare potentes; 288, 5, semper adundantes hastas frangit; 298, eripuerē patres pueris plorantibus offam; Cato, Agr. 156, 7, in aquam ferventem.

APPOSITIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

These are the most numerous uses of the participle, and express various relations, such as circumstances or situation, means, time, cause, or the adversative relation ('concession'), etc.

1. Circumstances or situation.

a) Nominative: Amph. 623, vigilans vidi, vigilans nunc te video, vigilans fabulor; 256, ad nos veniunt flentes; Asin. 593, abiens offers morbum; Aul. 6, obsecrans concredidit auri thesaurum; 7,

in medio foco defodit, venerans me ut id servarem; 727, quinam homo eiulans conqueritur maerens? Bacch. 48, sedens opperibere; 361, adveniens nomen mutabit mihi; Capt. 914, adveniens deturbavit totum cum carni carnarium; Cas. 664, omnes sub arcis, sub lectis latentes metu mussitant; 932, profugiens exeo hoc ornatu quo vides; Cist. 291, astans somnias; Cure. 338, saluto adveniens; Pers. 1, qui amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias; Poen. 261, quid hic malum astans opstipuisti? Liv. And. Trag. 12, ipse se in terram saucius fligit cadens; Enn. Trag. 212, numquam era errans mea domo efferret pedem Medea; Pacuv. 71, cum incultos pervestigans rimarem sinus; 158, te lacerabo et fatigans artus distraham; Acc. 192, hostem ut profugiens inimicis invadam in manus; Enn. Com. 3, mulier lacrimans ad genua accidit; Liv. And. Od. 19 utrum genua amploctens oraret; 20, ibi manens sedeto; Enn. Ann. 28, 2, talia tum memorat lacrumans; 55, 1, cum cura magna curantes, tum cupientes regni dant operam auspicio; Lucil. 478, quatenus vox ex tecto resonans meo gradu remoram facit? 651, huc praeteriens venit; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 11, 3, ut se ipsa stans sustinere non possit; 25, 3, Rhodienses superbos esse aiunt, id obiectantes.

b) Genitive: Asin. 591, quia tui amans abeuntis egeo; Hec. 517, nam audivisse vocem pueri visust vagientis.

c) Dative: Amph. 703, Bacchae bacchanti si velis advorsarier; Bacch. 233, unde aurum efficiam amanti erili filio; Cas. 63, ei dat operam absenti; Cist. 84, gessit morem oranti mihi; Cure. 149, gerite amanti mihi morem; Poen. 614, iam nunc illic egredienti sanguinem exsugam; Stich. 512, et magis par fuerat me vobis dare cenam advenientibus; And. 359, redeunti interea ex ipsa re mi incidit suspicio; H. T. 31, qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via decesse populum; Ad. 693, quid? credebas dormienti haec tibi confecturos deos? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 47, 19, si cui ancillae dormienti evenit; Pacuv. 215, repugnanti ego porro hunc vi detraxi ungulum.

d) Accusative: Amph. 701, huc nos dormientis detulit; Cas. 1003, nulla causast quin pendentem me verberes; Cist. 659 (eam) iacentem sustuli; Pseud. 1247, an id voltis, ut me hinc iacentem aliquis tollat? Most. 330; Stich. 765, stantem stanti saviu dare amicam amico; And. 414, nunc hunc venientem sequor; Phor. 520, te tuli, pollicitantem et nil ferentem; Acc. 60, ut me depositum et

maerentem nuntio repentino alacrem reddidisti! Liv. And. 20, donicum videbis me carpento vehementem en domum venisse.

e) Ablative: Pseud. 3, si ex te tacente fieri possem certior.

2. **Means:** Asin. 291, loquens lacerat diem; 709, ut cruciere currens; Men. 922, occidis fabulans; Merc. 56, ea quae omnis labores invenisset perferens; Rud. 26, a dis supplicans inveniet veniam sibi; Trin. 680, tu obiurgans me a peccatis rapis deteriorem in viam.

3. **Time,** chiefly with *adveniens*, *abiens*, etc.

a) Nominative: Aul. 303, ne quid animae forte amittat dormiens; Epid. 90, fidicinam quam abiens mandavit mihi; M. G. 179, abiens ita respondit; Most. 1103, nimio plus sapio sedens; Poen. 692, adveniens irem in carcerem; Rud. 71, vehemens sum exoriens, quom occido vehementior; Stich. 406, olim quos abiens adfeci aegrimonia; And. 284, iam ferme moriens me vocat; Eun. 830, istucine interminata sum hinc abiens tibi? Phor. 758, offendi adveniens conlocatam gnatam; Ad. 457, ille tibi moriens nos commendavit senex; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 15, 10,ensem quem abiens reliquisse dicitur; 15, 5, Aurunci primum possederunt, inde Achaei Troia domum redeuntes.

b) Dative: Bacch. 198, non impetratum id advenienti redderem? 769; Capt. 1004, haec mihi advenienti upupa datast; Most. 430, unde advenienti sarcinam imponam seni; Poen. 1151; Trin. 869; Ad. 92, hoc advenienti quod mihi dixere!

c) Accusative: Amph. 706, quae me advenientem noluerit salutare; 711; 714; 978; Bacch. 101, bene me accipies advenientem; Hec. 237, quod heri nemo voluit visentem ad eam te intro admittere.

4. **Cause:** Amph. 1112, ego cunas recessim rursum vorsum trahere et ducere, metuens pueris, mihi formidans; M. G. 1164, quasi ex hoc matrimonio abierim, cupiens istius nuptiarum; Rud. 560, signum amplexae tenent, nescio quid metuentes; 274, nunc tibi amplectimur genua egentes opum; And. 585, idque adeo metuens vos celavi; Eun. 133, pretium sperans ilico producit; Hec. 601, quam fortunatus sum hanc matrem habens talem!

5. **Adversative relation:** Asin. 290, quid ego hic properans concessio pedibus? Acc. 626.

6. **With adverbial force:** Amph. 661, me temptat sciens? Asin. 568, ubi sciens infidus fueris; so 562; Bacch. 569, loqueris nugae nunc

sciens; Cas. 63; 675; 979; and frequently; Cas. 809, lubens fecero et solens; and often; Capt. 50, ignorans suo sibi servit patri; Rud. 367, properans exsolvi restim.

PREDICATE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

1. Nominative: Amph. 256, ad nos veniunt flentes; 290, cum Alcumena cubat amans; Bacch. 22, qui annos xx errans a patria afuit; 109, te sequor exspectans quas res geras; Cist. 123, flens abiit; so 132; 192; 567, amplexa est genua plorans, obsecrans; M. G. 201, adstitit severo fronte curans, cogitans; Acc. 417, cuius aditum exspectans pervixi usque adhuc; Naev. Bell. Pun. 4, exhibant flentes; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), 2, 9, iterum triumphans endo urbem Romam rediit; so also CIL, i, 541; Enn. Ann. 177, Illyrii restant sicis sibunisque fodentes; 234, aspectabat virtutem legionis suae exspectans si mussaret; Sat. 478, advenis . . . lupino escam impetu petens.

2. Accusative. This occurs especially with verbs of seeing, perceiving, etc., and with verbs of making. Examples: Bacch. 451, quem astantem video; Cas. 354, videre ardentem te; Cist. 547, vidi exeuntem mulierem; Curc. 277, parasitum tuum currentem video; Merc. 598, quem currentem video; M. G. 320, quam vidisse aibas te osculantem atque amplexantem; 1136; Rud. 163, mulierculas video sedentis; Asin. 878, si accubantem virum conspexeris; Bacch. 204, me exeuntem aspexisti; Epid. 435, quis illic est quem huc advenientem conspicio? Merc. 109, currentem servum conspicio; Bacch. 859, nihil est quod mavelim quam illum cubantem opprimere; Rud. 387, sedentem flentemque opprimes; Amph. 1098, uxorem tuam neque gementem neque plorantem audivimus; Most. 934; And. 838, egomet vidi iurgantem ancillam; Hec. 806, quid Bacchidem exeuntem video? Ad. 305; And. 84, observabam servolos venientis aut abeuntis; H. T. 285, texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus; 366; Turp. 74, aspexit virginem ibi stantem; Amph. 529, lacrumantem concinnas uxorem; 789, haec nos delirantis facere dictis postulat; 1030, quem ego faciam ferventem flagris; Asin. 48, propterea quod me non scientem feceris; Men. 444, dicto me emit audientem, haud imperatorem sibi; H. T. 873, nam te scientem faciam; Eun. 36.

3. Ablative Absolute. This also is a predicate use of the parti-

ciple. The construction has a very limited range in Early Latin, occurring chiefly in the case of *praesens* and *absens*. Examples: Amph. 749, *me quidem praesente numquam factumst*; Cas. 423, *praesente hoc plura verba fieri non desidero*; Bacch. 263; II. T. 1042, *pudet dicere hac praesente*; Hec. 674; Eun. 1059; Acc. 428, *praesente his*; yet *illis praesentibus* in Bacch. 301; Amph. 827, *teque absente hic munus fungatur tuom*; 811; Phor. 258, *bonas me absente hic confecistis nuptias*; Eun. 649, *absente nobis*; so Afran. 6; but Stich. 131 and elsewhere *illisce absentibus*. At Amph. 400 the MSS. have *nobis praeter me*; Nonius, *nobis praesente*. Other verbs are less frequent: Amph. 747, *etiam adstante hoc Sosia*; 998, *hic deludetur vobis inspectantibus*; Asin. 403, *quassanti capite incedit*; so Bacch. 305; Men. 272, *me lubente feceris*; M. G. 144, *sene sciente hoc feci*; Poen. 322, *nam vigilante Venere si veniant*; II. T. 913, *se vidente*; Eun. 956, *conligavit? :: et quidem orante Thaide*; Hec. 830, *eum haec cognovit Myrrina in digito modo me habente*; Ad. 507, *non me indicente haec fiunt*; Enn. Trag. 59, *qui te sic tractavere nobis respectantibus*; Pacuv. 411, *occidente sole inhorrescit mare*; Enn. Ann. 327, *pereunte viro raucus sonus aere cucurrit*.

ADJECTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

It is not always easy to distinguish between the adjective and participial use. The following are among the clearest examples of genuine adjective uses: Capt. 912, *lupus esuriens*; so Poen. 6; 31; Rud. 3, *sum splendens candida stella*; Ad. 761, *senex delirans*; Bacch. 459, *opsequens oboediensque est*; Asin. 620, *oculi sunt lacrumantes*; Cato, Agr. 142, *domino dicto audiens sit*; Prooem. 4, *minime male cogitantes sunt*. Most of the examples cited under this head by Tammelin, op. cit. p. 28 ff., seem to me to be illustrations of the attributive use of the participle.

SUBSTANTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

Here again there is difficulty in distinguishing with precision whether we have true substantive uses or whether the participial value is to be recognized. In most of the examples cited by Tammelin, op. cit. p. 30 ff. we should probably supply in sense an indefinite pronoun, e.g. Aul. 811, *vocem loquentis audire visus sum*; Curc. 199,

bene monstrantem pugnis caedis; Rud. 260, vox me precantum huc foras excitavit; Epid. 112, nihil agit qui diffidentem verbis solatur suis. Even examples of this type are infrequent. Instances of genuine substantives are: Truc. 26, quot amans exemplis ludificetur, where *amans* = *amator*. So Most. 171, ut lepide ea omnis res tenet sententiasque amantum; Eun. 232, stulto intellegens quid interest?

TIME OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

The present participle, as is well recognized, regularly denotes an action or state contemporary with that of the verb with which it is associated. But in a few instances the participle seems to denote a prior action, e.g. Capt. 9, eumque hinc profugiens vendidit; Truc. 382, sed quod ego facinus audiui adveniens tuom? Less certain illustrations of the same usage are passages like Amph. 799, adveniens ilico me salutavisti; Pseud. 1201, dudum adveniens extemplo sumbolum servo tuo, where *ilico* and *extemplo* emphasize the practical identity of time between the action of the verb and the participle. Very likely the same feeling was present in Pers. 731, transcendi loris omnis adveniens domi, and other passages without *ilico* or any similar word, as Bacch. 361; Poen. 601; Eun. 458.

In general it is to be noted that in Early Latin the present participle is not used with the freedom with which it is employed later. It is confined likewise to a very limited number of verbs, of which *advenio* is by far the most important. As may be seen by the foregoing examples, plural uses are relatively much rarer than those of the singular.

The Future Active Participle.

The only examples of this (apart from the employment of the future active participle in the periphrastic conjugation) are: Asin. 634, Diabolus ipsi daturus dixit (probably a Grecism), and C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, qui prodeunt dissuasuri.

The Perfect Passive Participle.¹

SOME PECULIARITIES IN TENSE AND VOICE FUNCTION.

1. The perfect participle of deponents often denotes not a prior, but a simultaneous, action, e.g. Amph. 290, qui complexus cum Alcumena

¹ Brugmann, Die mit dem Suffix *-to* gebildeten Partizipia im Verbalssystem des Lateinischen, Indog. Forschungen, V, p. 89 ff.

cubat; Asin. 640, suavius complexos fabulari; Rud. 560, signum flentes amplexae tenent; so 695, nixae; 1203; Phor. 315, patris ais conspectum veritum hinc abisse.

2. The perfect participle of deponents occasionally has passive force, e.g. Asin. 196, ubi illaec quae dedi ante? : : abusa; M. G. 903, probe meditatam utramque ducō; so also Pers. 465; 466; Pseud. 941; 1204; Trin. 817; M. G. 1103, sororem adesse et matrem dicitō, quibus concomitata deveniat domum; Eun. 384, nos nostramque adulescentiam habent despiciatam; so also Cas. 189.

3. A few verbs, not otherwise used in the passive, form a perfect passive participle having active or neuter meaning, e.g. Poen. 736, ex-templo denegabit. : : iuratus quidem; Pseud. 792; Rud. 48; Pacuv. 33, iurati cernant; Epid. 144, ante occasum solem; so also Men. 437; 1022; Lucil. 55, quae sublata omnia sunt sole occaso obductoque; 744, quom bene potus recessit; Cael. Antip. (Peter), 104, 3, custodibus discessis multi interficiuntur; Pseud. 996, novi; notis (= eis qui norunt) praedicās. This usage is an Indo-European inheritance. In Indo-European the verbal in *-tos* was not restricted to either voice, but was used freely now with active, now with passive, force. The Greek verbal in *-ρός* similarly often shows active meanings.

ATTRIBUTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

Examples: Capt. 1006, exoptate gnate; Cure. 306, Curculio exoptate; Capt. 1020, meritam mercedem dabo; Enn. Trag. 209, in ea delecti viri vecti petebant pellem inauratam; 389, bene facta male locata; Pacuv. 238, atque eccum in ipso tempore ostentum! Acc. 381, reprime vim citatum quadrupedum; 395, interruptum nimbū; 678, splendida mundi sidera binis continuis sex picti spoliis.

APPOSITIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

The perfect participle in its appositive use does not show the same clear equivalence to various types of subordinate clauses (temporal, causal, adversative, etc.) as we noted in the case of the present participle. Nor is there the same variety in case use. Ordinarily we find only the nominative and accusative. The following examples, therefore, are presented without any attempt at

classification: Bacch. 271, damnatus demum, vi coactus reddidit cc Philippum; Capt. 145, expertus quanti fuerit, desidero; Cas. 628, ne quid in te mali faxit ira percita; 855, acceptae bene eximus; Cist. 202, ut vobis victi Poeni poenas sufferant; 224, neque mihi ulla abest perditio perimies; 729, folio intorta implicat se; And. 780, coactus legibus eam uxorem ducet; Eun. 178, labascit victus uno verbo; Phor. 469, ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta poteretur mali; Naev. Com. 101, sedens in cella circumtectus tegetibus pinxit; Stat. 26, ea tum compressa parit huic puerum; Turp. 8, non ago hoc per sagam pretio conductam; Afran. 245, occasionem nanta mulier involat in collum; Enn. Ann. 28, 13, haec eefatus repente recessit; Lucil. 339, Carpathium mare transvectus cenabis Rhodi. At times the participle is equivalent to a relative clause: Cist. 124, parvolam puellam proiectam sustuli; so Cist. Arg. 5, eam sublatam meretrix alii detulit. Followed by a predicative accusative: Cas. Arg. 6, ducit civem Casinam cognitam; so also Cist. Arg. 10. Sometimes the participle is equivalent to a coördinate clause, as: Enn. Trag. 355, extemplo acceptam me necato; Acc. 70, amplexa, fructum quem di dant cape!

PREDICATE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

1. Nominative. Many of the uses classed by Tammelin as appositionive seem to me to belong under the head of predicate uses, e.g. Epid. 691, ego solutus adsto; Capt. 330, filius meus apud vos servit captus; Cas. 540, ornata exspectat domi. In all of these the essential thing *predicated* is expressed by the participle. Other examples are: Aul. 721a, male perditus, pessume ornatus eo; Bacch. 298, eo exanimatus fui; 349, ille est oneratus; Capt. 891, iterum natus videor; 447, tua huc ornatus reveniam ex sententia; Cas. 768 candide vestitus, lautus exornatusque ambulat; Curc. 289, qui incedunt suffarcinati; And. 909, itan huc paratus advenis? H. T. 391, desertae vivimus; Acc. 255, crines propessi (*de conj.*) iacent; Enn. Trag. 78, arae fractae et disiectae iacent; Pacuv. 232, exspectata advenis; Enn. Ann. 330, nisi victus fatetur (a Grecism).

2. Accusative:

a) Miscellaneous expressions: Bacch. 750, vinctum te adservet; Bacch. 935, has tabellas consignatas quas fero; Capt. 205, si solutos

sinat; 351, mittam istunc aestumatum; so 364; 379; 446, satin habes, mandata quae sunt facta si refero? Stich. 132, vosne patiar cum mendicis nuptas viris?

b) Verbs of seeing, etc. Cas. 922, ubi saltum video obsaeptum; Cist. 298, video ego te amoris valde tactum toxico; Pseud. 163, haec facite ut offendam parata; And. 234, quidnam Pamphilum exanimatum video? H. T. 426, sed ipsum foras egressum video; Hec. 325, quo modo nunc te offendam adfectam? Stat. 225, te suffareinatam vidi.

c) Verbs of making:

Facio (especially in the phrase *missum facio*): Amph. 1145, missum facio Teresiam senem; Merc. 84; 657; 1000, missas ego istas artis feci; Rud. 800, te faxo recte acceptum, ut dignus es; M. G. Arg. 10, impellit omissam faciat concubinam; Lucil. 748; Ad. 906, missa haec face! Hec. 408.

Reddo: Bacch. 198, non impetratum id adveniēti ei redderem? 767, tam frictum ego illum reddam; And. 864, ego iam te commotum reddam; Phor. 856; Acc. 60.

Do: Cas. 439, factum et curatum dabo; Cist. 595, perfectum ego hoc dabo negotium; Pseud. 926; And. 683, hoc tibi inventum dabo; Eun. 213; Pacuv. 30, quid me moneris effectum dabo.

Other verbs: Curc. 385, ego hoc effectum lepide tibi tradam; Aul. 695, ut istuc quod me oras impetratum ab eo auferam; Most. 786, adfero omne impetratum; And. 684, inventum tibi curabo et mecum adductum tuom Pamphilum, where *curo* = *reddo*.

d) Volo, cupio, etc.: Bacch. 495, factum volo; 603, dirumptum velim; Capt. 53, vos quod monitos voluerim; Cas. 326, velim diruptam; Cist. 299, te volo monitum; 704, sunt qui volunt te conventam; Curc. 83, istunc adflictum velim; 103, ibi me sepultam velim; Aul. 677, di me salvom et servatum volunt; Cas. 286, nihil est me cupere factum; 814, di me cupiunt servatum; Curc. 304, te conventum cupit; And. 667, si omnes hunc coniectum in nuptias inimici vellent; Ad. 372, si quid recte curatum velis; 165, nollem factum; Phor. 797, nollem datum.

Despite the fact that we often find the infinitive with these verbs (e.g. Hec. 727, Laches me nunc conventam esse expetit; cf. p. 428), yet I am in agreement with Tammelin, p. 77 ff., who holds that

unless *esse* is expressed, it is more natural to recognize the simple participle.

e) *Habeo*,¹ *teneo*, etc. Several distinct types of usage fall under this head:

Habeo, 'keep,' in the literal sense: *Merc.* 360, *nequiquam apscondidi, abstrusam habebam*; *M. G.* 1334, *capita inter se nimis nexa habent*; *Rud.* 748, *liberos parentibus sublectos habebis?* *Trin.* 909, *non placet qui amicos intra dentes conclusos habet*; *Phor.* 744, *conclusam hic habeo uxorem saevam*.

Habeo, 'keep,' in transferred sense: *Bacch.* 26, *quae sodalem atque me exercitos habet*; *Epid.* 529, *aerumna exercitam med habet*; *M. G.* 564, *hominem servom suos domitos habere oportet oculos*; *Men.* 801; *Pers.* 856; *CIL*, i, 198, 18, *discriptos habeto*.

Habeo despiciatam = *despikor*: *Cas.* 189, *vir me habet despiciatam*; *so Eun.* 384; *Bacch.* 572, *neque tu me habebis falso suspectum*; *Cato, Agr.* 5, 6, *boves maxima diligentia curatos habeto* (= *curato*); *Pseud.* 602, *illa omnia missa habeo* (= *mitto*); *Stich.* 362, *res omnis relictas habeo* (= *relinquo*).

Habeo, 'regard,' *Poen.* 542, *per iocum dictum habeto*.

Haeco with the perfect participle has the force of the present perfect: *Cist.* 319, *hasce aedis conductas habet*; *Bacch.* 550, *quod in se fuit, accuratum habuit*; *Men.* 583, *qui aut faenore aut periuriis habent rem paratam*; *M. G.* 885, *multos saepe vidi regionem fugere consili prius quam repertam haberent*; *Poen.* 594, *ccc nummos numeratos habet*; *Trin.* 838, *satis partum habeo*; *Hee.* 582, *tuos pater narravit modo quo pacto me habueris praepositam amoris tuo*; 751, *pollicerer tibi, segregatum (sc. me) habuisse a me Pamphilum*; *Cato, Frag. (Jord.)*, 77, 2, *quid exquisitum habeam*.

Examples of similar verbs: *Amph.* 341, *tu qui Volcanum in cornu conclusum geris*; *Rud.* 1144, *o mei parentes, hic vos conclusos gero*; *Bacch.* 181, *me vadatum amore vinetumque attines*; *Truec.* 837, *testis vinetos attines*.

f) With *opus est*, *usus est*.

Opus est, e.g. *Bacch.* 398, *obvigilatost opus*; *Merc.* 466, *cauto opust*; *Most.* 902; *Men.* 592, *minus quam opus fuerat dicto*; *Hee.* 431, *in arcem transcurso opus est*; *H. T.* 80; *Cato, Frag. (Jord.)*, 37, 13, *non opus est*

¹ Thielmann, *Archiv für lat. Lexikog.* ii, p. 372 ff.; 509 ff.

recitato; Stich. 61, quod opus facto; Merc. 330, hoc nunc mihi viso opus; Phor. 762, nunc quid opus facto sit vide; Pacuv. 35; Bacch. 219; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, quae opus sint locato; Cas. 502, nam mihi vicino hoc etiam convento est opus; Cure. 302, hoc homine convento est opus; 322, illis conventis opus est; Pseud. 732, sed quinque inventis opus est argenti minis; Hec. 664, videte iam remissan opus sit vobis, reductan domum; 104; 866.

Usus est: Cist. 129, tacere nequeo quod tacito usus est; Trin. 503, ubi usus nil erat dicto; Asin. 312, nunc audacia usust nobis inventa et dolis; Hec. 327, non usus factost mihi nunc hunc intro sequi; 878; Ad. 429, moneo quid facto usus sit.

3. Ablative Absolute. With the perfect participle the ablative absolute construction has a greater range of use than the present participle. The present participle is confined to a very few verbs, while the perfect is employed in a considerable variety. Examples: Amph. 967, evoca Blepharonem, qui re divina facta mecum prandeat; Capt. 82, item parasiti rebus prolatis latent; And. 923, Atticus quidam olim navi fracta ad Andrum eiectus est; Ad. 286, ego iam transacta re convortam me domum; Naev. Trag. 16, passo velo vicinum in portum fer; Enn. Ann. 194, 5, consilio lato indu foro sanctoque senatu; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), 1, 7, ea pugna pugnata; Acc. 548, abiecta gloria; Pacuv. 200, neu reliquias meas sireis denudatis ossibus per terram divexarier; 347, pastor exorto iubare, noctis decurso itinere; Lucil. 55, quae sublata omnia sunt sole occaso obductoque; CIL, i, 541, Corinto deleto.

ADJECTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

Besides the familiar *doctus*, *mortuos*, *perditus*, *meritus*, *transvorsus*, there is little to cite. In M. G. 7, quia se iam pridem feriatam gestitem, *feriatum* is fairly adjective in character. So also Acc. 461, abstruso in flumine; 314, probis probatum potius quam multis fore. But most of the examples given by Tammelin, p. 51 ff., and Sidey, p. 4 f., seem to me rather to illustrate real participles used attributively.

SUBSTANTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

According to Brugmann, Indog. Forsch. V, p. 140, this use in the neuter is Indo-European. Brugmann recognizes two categories of

such Indo-European neuter uses of the *-to* verbal: (1) The verbal indicates an event or state; (2) It indicates something connected in some way with the act or state as subject or predicate. Besides neuters we also have masculines and feminines used substantively. In addition to the common *dicta, facta, mandata, promissa, optata, praecepta*, we find: Men. 979, nimio edo lubentius molitum quam molitum praehibeo; Aul. 430, quid curas utrum crudumne an coctum edim? Most. 1000, vidi efferri mortuom; Poen. 880, doctus; Ad. 751, nova nupta eadem haec discet; Cure. 37; Enn. Ann. 194, 15, multa tenens antiqua sepulta. Especially in prepositional phrases: *de audito, ex audito, ex occulto*, as Pacuv. 185, sermonem nostrum ex occulto clepsit; Trag. Incert. 158, praeter rogatum si hisces.

SPECIAL IDIOMATIC USES OF THE PARTICIPLE.

Common to both the present and perfect participle is the use whereby a noun or pronoun with a participle is equivalent to a verbal noun with a genitive of the substantive, as, occisus Caesar aliis pessimum videbatur, 'the murder of Caesar.' Examples: Asin. Arg. 6, ob praereptam mulierem; Bacch. 367, super auro amicaque eius inventa; 424, ante solem exorientem; Cas. 84, post transactam fabulam; Cist. 686 (ea) perdita perdidit me, 'its loss has ruined me'; Epid. 144, ante occasum solem; so also Men. 437; 1022; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 80, 10, ob rem bene gestam; CIL, i, 577, 1, ab colonia deducta anno xc.

THE GERUNDIVE.¹

The origin and primitive force of the gerundive are shrouded in obscurity. Some think it was originally active; others passive.²

¹ Krause, De gerundii et gerundivi apud antiquissimos Romanos scriptores usu, 1875; Adrian, Ueber den lat. Part. Praesens passivum, 1875; Kvicala, Syntaktische Untersuchungen, II, Gerundium und Gerundivum, Wiener Studien, ii, p. 218 ff.; Platner, Gerund and Gerundive in Plautus and Terence, Am. Jour. Phil. XIV, p. 483 ff.; Weisweiler, Das lat. Partic. Fut. Passivi, 1890; Lebreton, Mémoires de la Soc. de Linguistique, xi, p. 145 ff.; Herkenrath, De gerundii et gerundivi apud Plautum et Cyprianum usu, 1894; Dosson, De participii gerundivi antiquissima vi, 1887; Bayard, De gerundivi et gerundii vi antiquissima, 1902; Gustafsson, De gerundiis et gerundivis Latinis (Eranos V), 1904; Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 449 ff.

² Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 608, calls it medio-passive, citing *oriendus, secundus*, etc.

Some regard it as present; others as future. In Early Latin certainly its force is almost invariably future and passive. Weisweiler defines it as denoting "eine zu vollziehende Tätigkeit," which accords well with the earliest usage. Whether the gerund or the gerundive is the earlier, is still unsettled. In Early Latin the gerund is more frequent than the gerundive, though that circumstance is, of course, not decisive.

1. The gerundive as adjective: *caedundus*, 'fit to be killed,' 'tender': Capt. 819, qui locant caedundos agnos, 'who contract (to furnish) tender lambs'; Aul. 567, caedundum conduxi illum, 'I contracted that he should be tender'; in a different sense: Cas. 528, caedundus tu homo es; *expetendus*: Pers. 521, forma expetenda virginem; Phor. 1024, an mea forma magis expetendast? *oriundus*: Poen. 1055: inde sum oriundus; *mirandus*: Rud. 345, haud miranda facta dicis; *pu dendus*: Truc. 269, pudendumst vero clurinum pecus; Trag. Inc. 63, pudendam hortabar fugam; *animum advortendus*: And. 767, o facinus animum advortendum; *miserandus*: Phor. 1008, facinus miserandum; *volvendus*: Enn. Ann. 386, clamor volvendus per aethera vagit; *cupiendus*: Enn. Trag. 256, stultus est qui non cupienda cupiens cupienter cupit; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 42, 8, quae neque fanda neque legenda audivimus. In these last two the adjective is used substantively.

2. The gerundive as participle in the nominative: M. G. 891, quom venit nobis faciundum utrumque; Ad. 337, hoc proferundum tibi videtur? Afran. 111, datur mihi custodiendus.

3. The genitive of the gerundive.

a) Dependent on nouns.

caput: Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), i, 10, caput patrandae pacis.

causa: Capt. 889, liberorum quaerundorum causa; Eun. 620, retinendi illius causa; Enn. Trag. 97, liberum quaesundum causa; Ann. 218, causa poliendi agri; Cato, Agr. 140, operis faciundi causa; CIL, i, 200, 51, rei procurandae causa.

copia: Bacch. 487, illius inspectandi copia; Capt. 748, ut mihi eius facias conveniundi copiam; Phor. 176, eius amittendi copia; Merc. 850, date conveniundi eius copiam!

finis: Lucil. 119, 6, quaerendae finem rei scire.

gratia: Enn. Trag. 120, liberorum quaesundum gratia; Pacuv. 43, parentum incertum investigandum gratia.

insolentia: Acc. 275, luminis conspiciendi insolentia.

intercapedo: Turp. 184, intercapedo sumpti faciundi.

locus: H. T. 218, cognoscendi et ignoscendi peccati locus.

potestas: Amph. 638, viri potestas videndi; M. G. 1010, <eius> conveniundi potestas; Truc. 293, potestatem coloris ulli capiendi; And. 541, quocius potestas summa servandi; Phor. 880, potestatem eius adhibendae dari; Pacuv. 220, potestatem inquirendi mei parentis.

spes: Rud. 1145, spes vestrum cognoscendum; Phor. 827, spes huiusce habendae.

tempus: Cato, Agr. 61, 2, tempus oleae serendae.

b) With adjs.: Cato, Agr. Prooem, 3, studiosum rei quaerendae.

c) With prepositions: Cato, Agr. 139, illius sacri coercendi ergo; 141, 3, agri mei lustrandi lustrique faciundi ergo.

With the genitive of the personal pronouns the gerundive does not change for the feminine, but we regularly have the form in *-i*; Truc. 370, tui (fem.) videndi copias; Hec. 372, eius videndi cupidus; Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 444 f.

4. The dative of the gerundive: Amph. 288, nox scitast exercendo scorto; Asin. 250, argento comparando fingere fallaciam; 252, inveniundo argento fingeres fallaciam; Aul. 148, liberis procreandis uxorem ducere; Merc. 192, armamentis complicandis, componendis studuimus; Stich. 678, lectis sternendis studuimus, munditiis adparandis; Merc. 551, rei tuae quaerundae convenit operam dare; 987, rei agundae operam dare; M. G. 745, serviendae servituti servos instruxi; Most. 288, purpura aetati occultandaest; Pers. 428, referundae linguam natam gratiae; 560, centumplex murus rebus servandis parumst; 689, lucro faciundo auspicavi; Poen. 1189, da diem sospitem rebus mis agundis; Rud. 757, optimum esse operi faciundo corium; 1374, ius iurandum rei servandae, non perdendae conditum est; Trin. 229, utrum aetati agundae arbitrer firmiorem; 365, fictorem probum vitae agundae; Truc. 731, lamentando pausam fecit filio; Hec. 821, his rebus anulus fuit initium inveniundis; Ad. 545, huic esse natum rei, ferundis miseriis; Cato, Agr. 6, 2, ager oleto conserundo bonus; 146, 2, oleae legendae, faciendae; CIL, i, 577, 4, lex parieti faciundo; Crassus (Meyer), 270, patrimonio augendo.

5. The accusative of the gerundive:

a) Limiting an object and indicating the purpose of the action:

With *do*: Asin. 444, quos utendos dedi; 676, hanc mi servandam dedit; 778, spectandum ne quoi anulum det; Aul. 250, te elinguan-
dam; 311, famem utendam; Bacch. 338, aurum servandum; Cist.
166, puellam exponendam; 182; 648; Curc. 603, mater ei utendum
(sc. anulum) dederat; Men. 657; 659, pallium utendum; 733, (eam)
concinnandam; Merc. 238, quam dederam servandam; M. G. 567,
me excrucians; Pers. 117, nummos utendos; Pers. 127, filiam
utendam; 128; 440; Poen. 338, pulchram spectandam dare; 1018;
1302; Rud. 602, scalas utendas; H. T. 629, ei dedi exponendam;
650; 655; Eun. 902, servandum quicquam; Ph. 466, vitam tu-
tandam; Ad. 114, tuum filium dedisti adoptandum mihi; 463;
Enn. Trag. 277, auris tibi contra utendas dabo; Frag. (Baehr.) 515;
Naev. Com. 78.

With *rogo*: Aul. 96, quae utenda rogant; M. G. 347; Cato,
Agr. 5, 3.

With *peto*: Aul. 400, artoptam utendam peto.

Other expressions: Eun. 1087, hunc comedendum vobis propino
et deridendum; Pacuv. 192, paedagogandum accipit; Phor. 364,
agrum colendum habebat; CIL, i, 200, 25, queiquomque id publicum
fruendum habebit; Poen. 646, hunc ad te diripiendum adducimus.

b) The accusative and accompanying gerundive are equivalent to
an object clause:

With *loco*: Aul. 251, ut me castrandum loces; 568, loces (eum)
efferendum; Pers. 160, praebenda aediles locaverunt; Cato, Agr.
14, 1, villam aedificandam si locabis; 144, 1, oleam legendam locare;
145, 1, oleam faciundam locare. Passive: Cato, Agr. 144, 4, nequis
concedat quo olea legunda et faciunda carius locetur; 145, 1, si
facienda locata erunt.

With *do*: Curc. 439, statuam vult dare auream solidam faciendam;
Men. 541, inauris da mihi faciendas; M. G. 803, si ipsi Soli quae-
rendas dares; Ad. 585, lectulos faciundos dedit; Cato, Agr. 16, calcem
partiario coquendam qui dant.

With *curo*: And. 865, cura adservandum; CIL, i, 1166, haec faci-
enda coiravit; semitas, basilicam calecandam.

c) Accusative of the gerundive with prepositions:

With *ad*: Amph. 669, ad aquam praebendam; Asin. 557, fortior
ad sufferendas plagas; Men. 16, ad narrandum argumentum adest

benignitas; Merc. 15, si advortendum ad animum adest benignitas; M. G. 79, ad enarrandum hoc argumentum est comitas; Poen. 599; Pseud. 400, neque ad detexundam telam certos terminos; Trin. 232, plus voluptatis ad aetatem agundam; 646, ad quaerundum honorem; And. 182, ad disturbandas nuptias; 287, inutiles ad rem tutandam; H. T. 133, magis ad haec utenda idonea; Phor. 225, ad defendendam noxiam; 266, ad defendendam causam; Pacuv. 51, quod primordium capissam ad stirpem exquirendum; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, ad Iovem optimum maximum Iunonemque et Minervam ceterosque deos salutandos ibo; Cato, Agr. 31, 1, ad oleam legendam; 114, 2, ad alvom movendam; so 115, 1; 115, 2.

With *inter* : Cist. 721, inter rem agendam.

With *ob* : Com. Incert. 32, tetulit coronam ob colligandas nuptias; Trag. Inc. 86, ob defendendam Graeciam; Cato, Agr. 134, 4, ob struem obmovendam et fertum libandum.

6. The ablative of the gerundive:

a) With verbs: Epid. 433, pugnīs memorandis meis eradicabam hominū auris; Pseud. 1045, cor retunsumst oppugnando pectore; Truc. 310, non meretriculis moenerandis rem coegit; And. 938, animust commotus mirando tanto bono; H. T. 142, opere rustico faciundo sumptum exsercirent suom; Enn. Trag. 134, nisi patrem materno sanguine exanclando ulciscerem; Acc. 659, quaenam umquam poenis luendis dabitur satias supplici? Naev. Com. 18, caepe edundo oculus profluit; 28, polluxi tibi iam publicando epulo Herculis; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.) 1, 9, duello magno dirimendo, regibus subigendis; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, vestros honores rebus gerendis praecessi; Cato, Agr. 139 (*bis*), hoc porco piaculo immolando; 132, 1, hac illace dape pollucenda; so 2; 134, 2, te hac strue ommovenda bonas preces precor; so 3; 134, 2, te hoc ferto ommovendo bonas preces precor; 141, 3, hisce suovetaurilibus laetentibus inmovendis; so 4; Frag. (Jord.), 43, 7, omnem adolescentiam meam abstinui, agro colendo, silicibus repastinandis atque conserendis; Lucil. 101, spatium curando corpore (Dousa -i) honestum sumemus.

b) With adjectives: Asin. 873, opere faciendo lassus; Cas. 124, te aggerunda curvom aqua faciam; Pers. 5, fio miser quaerendo argento; Poen. 224, aggerundaque aqua sunt viri duo defessi; Vid. 33, talis iactandis tuae sunt consuetae manus; Enn. Trag. 43,

fatis fandis dementem invitam ciet; Lucil. 167, lippus edenda cepa.

c) Ablative of the gerundive with prepositions:

With *de*: Hec. 391, de (ea) reducenda; so 403; Bacch. 223; Eun. 784, consilium de ocludendis aedibus; CIL, i, 198, 76, de ceivitate danda; 198, 11, de patrono repudiando; 198, 19, de nomine deferundo iudicibusque legundeis; 198, 58, de leitibus aestumandeis.

With *ex*: Cato, Frag. (Jord.) 78, 7, ex medicamentis bibendis, ex alvo lavando.

With *in*: Amph. 1, in mercimoniis emundis vendundisque; 633, in aetate agunda; Stich. 55, in cogitando maerore augeor; And. 5, in prologis scribundis; H. T. 73, in opere faciundo; 74, in illis exercendis; Phor. 225, in re incipiunda; Ad. 967, in psaltria emunda; Enn. Ann. 257, aetate in agunda; Lucil. 495, aggere in iaciendo; 561, in re agenda; Metellus (Meyer), p. 203, in quibus quaerendis sapientes aetatem exigent; CIL, i, 202, II, 15, in praeconibus legundis.

With *pro*: Pers. 426, pro liberanda amica; Pacuv. 104, pro merenda gratia redamptuare; Cato, Agr. 144, 5, pro ea olea legunda.

THE GERUND.

GENITIVE OF THE GERUND.¹

The genitive of the gerund is used with nouns and adjectives, chiefly in objective relation.

a) With nouns.

1) Without modifiers.

astutia: Pacuv. 358, quibus abest intellegendi astutia.

causa: And. 158, vera obiurgandi causa; Phor. 50, puer causa erit mittendi; Hec. 342; Afran. 134, tutandi causa; Cato, Agr. 145, 2, oleum ne tangito utendi causa neque furandi causa; CIL, i, 199, 31, colendi causa; Enn. Ann. 234, causa pugnandi.

compendium: Pseud. 605, compendium te facere pultandi volo.

copia: Epid. 162, non enim nunc dormitandi neque cunetandi copia est; M. G. 1226, vix fuit copia adeundi atque impetrandi; H. T. 28, date crescendi copiam; Eun. 21, inspiciundi copia; 638 f.;

¹ For the literature on the gerund, see above, p. 441, under the gerundive.

Pacuv. 117, cognoscendi aut contuendi copia; Enn. Ann. 288, 7, nec respirandi fit copia.

exemplum: M. G. 637, ut exemplum experiundi habeas.

facilitas: And. 232, date facilitatem pariundi.

finis: And. 821, orandi iam finem face; Phor. 22; 23, peccandi finem.

gratia: Curc. 706, dicendi gratia haec natast mihi; Acc. 217, ne quisquam epulandi gratia accumbat.

locus: Capt. 213, detis locum loquendi; so M. G. 603; And. 154, obiurgandi locus; Acc. 418, nullus causandi locus; 432, dicendi est locus.

lubido: Trin. 745, ducendi apscesserit lubido.

modus: Asin. 167, qui modus dandi?

morbus: Cato, Frag. (Jord), 57, 29, numquam tacet quem morbus tenet loquendi, tamquam veterosum bibendi atque dormiendi.

occasio: Capt. 117, fugiendi occasio; Epid. 271, occasio faciundi; Amph. Frag. iii, abiendi occasio.

otium: Ad. 420, otium auscultandi.

pars: Asin. 517, meam partem loquendi.

pausa: Acc. 290, pausa loquendi; so Lucil. 17.

potestas: Epid. 15, vix adipiscendi potestas fuit; Pacuv. 24, cernundi do potestatem omnibus.

prolixitudo: Pacuv. 127, fandi prolixitudine.

pudor: And. 630, denegandi pudor.

satietas: Poen. 215, neque ulla ornandi satis satietas; Pacuv. 410, tuendi satietas.

spatium: Phor. 702, spatium vocandi, sacrificandi; Pacuv. 207, spatium ulciscendi.

tempus: Pers. 468, id erit adeundi tempus; Trin. 423, tempust adeundi; Poen. 741, tacendi tempus est; Hec. 44, agendi tempus mihi datum est.

via: H. T. 583, ulla accedendi via.

vicissitas: Acc. 586, vicissitatem inperitandi.

2) With adverbial modifier.

causa: Hec. 255, sin east causa retinendi apud vos.

copia: Pers. 538, ut tibi recte conciliandi facerem copiam; Rud. 765, in capite tuo si conflandi copias.

labor: Pseud. 5, labori parsissem respondendi mihi.

locus: And. 232, in aliis potius peccandi locum.

potestas: Stich. 117, quoi male faciundi est potestas; And. 52, liberius vivendi potestas; Phor. 174.

principium: Stich. 671, domum redeundi principium placet.

spatium: And. 182, spatium cogitandi ad disturbandas nuptias.

spes: Afran. 350, spes reducendi domum.

tempus: Baech. 772, nunc est mihi adeundi ad hominem tempus; Merc. 916, tempus non est intro eundi; Trin. 998, loquendi libere videtur tempus venisse.

via: Poen. 629, male loquendi vobis nescivi viam.

3) With a direct object expressed or understood.

causa: Men. 687, neque te defrudandi caussa posco.

copia: H. T. 282, res dedit existumandi copiam vitae consuetudinem; Trin. 1131.

gratia: Curc. 706, non rem perdendi gratia.

labor: Pseud. 6, labori parsissem te rogandi.

locus: And. 354, quae non est narrandi locus.

occasio: Phor. 885, eludendi occasiost senes.

optio: Cas. 190, nec mihi ius meum optinendi optio est.

potestas: Stich. 281, potestas adipiscendist gloriam; Hec. 45, potestas condecorandi ludos scaenicos.

spatium: And. 806, spatium exquirendi meum factum; Capt. 743, spatiumst perferendi quae minitas; Phor. 701, spatium adparandi nuptias; Hec. 684, spatium amandi amicam.

4) Accompanied by another genitive dependent on the same governing noun: Capt. 852, nominandi istorum tibi erit magis quam edendi copia; 1008, lucis das tuendi copiam; H. T. 29, novarum spectandi faciunt copiam; Enn. Trag. 207, neve navis incohandi exordium. According to Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 444, the two genitives in these examples are equally dependent upon the governing noun; the gerund simply defines more particularly the relation of the substantive.

5) Peculiar are Capt. 153, edendi exercitus; Poen. 34, sermones fabulandi. In CIL, i, 542, tua pace rogans te cogendei dissolvendei tu ut facilia faxseis, *facilia* is very likely corrupt. It is generally explained as equivalent to *facilitatem*.

b) With adjectives: Hec. 91, cupida huc redeundi, abeundi a milite vosque videndi; 283, cupidus redeundi domum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 78, 13, colendi peritus; 80, 1, orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus, dicendi peritus.

c) Alone, denoting purpose, Ad. 270, ne id adsentandi magis quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes. This genitive is not to be explained as the result of ellipsis of *causa* or some similar word, but probably represents a primitive Italic usage seen also in Umbrian; Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, p. 197; cf. Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 445.

DATIVE OF THE GERUND.

Without object: Amph. 1006, auscultando operam dare; Asin. 169, quid modist ductando, amando? 882, quid modi amplexando facies? M. G. 1311, quid modi flendo facies? Poen. 231, neque lavando et fricando scimus facere neniam; Rud. 1205, osculando meliust pausam fieri.

With an object: Epid. 605, Epidicum operam quaerendo dabo; M. G. 260, hominem investigando operam dabo; Poen. 223, nos lavando, eluendo operam dederunt.

Stich. 681, curando, is corrupt. The dative of the gerund in Early Latin is confined to Plautus.

ACCUSATIVE OF THE GERUND.

This usage occurs only with prepositions.

a) With *ad*.

With nouns: Asin. 518, ad loquendum atque ad dicendum portisculum; Merc. 935, operam sumam ad pervestigandum; M. G. 80, si ad auscultandum vostra erit benignitas; And. 57, canes ad venandum; 138, nec satis ad obiurgandum causae; 150, vemens causa ad obiurgandum; H. T. 1044, principium capiam ad placandum; Phor. 423, aetas ad ducendum; 832, otium ad potandum; Ad. 25, ad scribundum industriam; Pacuv. 358, quibus abest ad praecavendum intellegendi astutia.

With adjectives: Bacch. 738, ad perdundum quam ad scribundum cita (codd.: *cito*, *scito*); Epid. 378, doctus ad male faciendum; M. G.

668, ad saltandum non cinaedus malacus aequet; Truc. 8, ad dene-gandum ut celeri lingua utamini; 22, non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est; And. 705, dies hic ut satis sit ad agendum; 706, vocivom ad narrandum; Phor. 533, qui prior ad dandumst; 818, tutus ad nar-randum locus; Pacuv. 23, sese adfines esse ad causandum volunt.

With verbs: Pseud. 850, quo conductus venio. : : ad furandum quidem; And. 1, animum ad scribendum adpulit; Phor. 240, ani-mum ad cogitandum instituere; Pacuv. 17, attendi ad quaerendum; 378, ad manticulandum astu aggreditur; Trag. Inc. 81, ego tum gra-vida expletis iam fere ad pariendum mensibus; 160, tam magis ad male faciendum viget.

b) With *inter*: Enn. Frag. 540, inter ponendum; Afran. 422, inter loquendum.

c) With *ob*: C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 233, pretia ob tacendum accipiunt.

It is doubtful whether Early Latin shows any instance of the accusative of the gerund with a direct object. The text in Cist. 648 and Poen. 599 (sometimes cited as illustrating this use) is uncertain.

THE ABLATIVE OF THE GERUND.

ABLATIVE WITHOUT PREPOSITIONS.

1. The gerund has a direct object: Cas. 809, dirumpi cantando hymenaeum; Men. 882, lumbi dolent manendo medicum; Trin. 1048, male fidem servando abrogant fidem; H. T. 114, eadem au-diendo victus est; 711, vera dicendo ut eos fallam; Eun. 7, bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male; 68, oculos terendo misere; 1008, defessa sum te ridendo; Hec. 254, ea refellendo aut purgando vobis corrigemus; Pacuv. 315, defessus sum perrogitando advenas; Lucil. 49, nomen causamque rogando exsculpo ut dicant.

2. The gerund is used alone without object or modifier: Amph. 414, legiones vi pugnando cepimus; 588, neque fando umquam accepit quisquam; Asin. 222, consuescunt osculando, oratione vinnula; 555, pugnando fugae potiti; 687; 903; Bacch. 429, luctando saliendo sese exercebant; 514, mendicum mendicando vincere; 981, ad lacrimas hominem coegi castigando; Capt. 502, me restitendo retinendo las-

sum reddiderunt; Curc. 52, nisi si est osculando in pudicior; 187, hos perire amando video; 215, vapulando et somno pereor; Epid. 177, eam vivendo vincere; 200, rogitando sum rucus factus; 320, exspectando exedor miser; 436, undantem chlamydem quassando facit; 496, fando istunc hominem nunquam audiui; Men. 882, lumbi sedendo, oculi spectando dolent; 1054, te eripio pugnando; Merc. 151, me rupi currendo; 312, ut med amando enices; M. G. 267, vi pugnandoque hominem caperest certa res; 1022, properando excrucior; Most. 453, pultando paene perfregi hasce; 456; 1015, potes dissimulando infectum hoc reddere; Pers. 56, parasitando paverint ventris; Poen. 778, nego; et negando arvio; Rud. 186, experiundo is datur acerbum; 361, periit potando; 1017, non probari pernegando potes; Stich. 70, exorando haud advorsando sumendam operam censeo; 313, defessus sum pultando; Truc. 15, dat operam ne sit relicuom poscendo atque auferendo; 327, lassus sum durando; 916, hic exspectando obdurui; Plaut. Frag. 81, superabo omnis argutando praeficas; And. 17, faciuntne intellegendo; 544, orando impetrare; 912, sollicitando et pollicitando; H. T. 86, aut consolando aut consilio; 330, orando surdas aures reddideras; 331, experiundo scies; 457, pytissando quid vini absumpsit; 675, quaerendo investigari; 879, deos gratulando obtundere; Eun. 554, rogitando obtundat; 846, miserrimus fugitando; Phor. 1034, accusando fieri infectum; Hec. 123, tundendo atque odio effecit; 234, peccando detrimenti nil fieri potest; 435, ut me ambulando rumperet; 815, cursando et ambulando hunc contrivi diem; Ad. 213, ego vapulando, ille verberando defessi sumus; 713, defessus sum ambulando; 847, favillae plena coquendo sit faxo et molendo; 880, si id fit dando atque obsequendo; Pacuv. 168, quod bellando aptus sum; 318, nilne a Troia adportat fando; 322, illum interea proliciendo propitiaturos remur; 374, id usus experiundo edocet; Acc. 66, ut frustrando protrahas; 233, istam imminuam curam infitiando; 475, astu et fallendo callet; 551, quod resonando flebilis voces refert; Stat. 150, ita plorando orando instando atque obiurgando me optudit; Afran. 210, defessa exspectando; 275, tacendo periisse; Enn. Ann. 147, 3, certando animam de corpore mitto; 191, cunctando restituit rem; 288, 4, nitendo corpus discernere ferro; Lucil. 673, nec ventorum flamina flando suda secundet; 712, maledicendo inmundis sermonibus differs; 777,

nonnumquam dabit ipsa aetas quod prosit habendo; 786, cantando quemquam adseruisse ait ad se; 815, Sisyphus versat saxum sudans nitendo; C. Gracchus (Meyer), 233, si tu loquendo talentum quae-sisti; Cato, Agr. 6, 2, ferundo arbor peribit; Frag. (Jord.), 83, 7, homines exercendo videmus conteri.

3. The gerund has an adverbial modifier: Amph. 1013, apud omnis aedis sacras sum defessus quaeritando; Asin. 222, bene salutando, consuescunt compellando blanditer; Bacch. 402, cave sis te superare servom siris faciundo bene; Capt. 832, prius quam pultando assulatum foribus exitium adfero; Cure. 508, male suadendo; Truc. 916, cubando in lecto; Phor. 697, nil est quin male narrando depravarier; Stat. 175, diu vivendo multa quae non volt videt; Paulus (Meyer), 201, annuendo enim votis meis id egerunt.

ABLATIVE DEPENDENT ON PREPOSITIONS.

1. With *a*: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 23, 1, trudere solent *a* recte consulendo atque intellegendo.

2. With *e*: Capt. 504, vix ex gratulando eminebam; Ad. 987, fieri ex adsentando, indulgendo et largiendo.

3. With *in*: Asin. 795, linguam in tussiendo proserat; Cas. 399, utinam in sortiundo sors deliquerit; Merc. 218, quid hic in lamentando pereor? Trin. 224, in cogitando dolorem indipiscor; 532, si in operendo possint interfieri; And. 771, in pariundo aliquot adfuerunt; H. T. 323, in potiundo periculum; 665, ne nunc animo esses duro, ut olim in tollendo; Eun. 893, in cognoscendo tute ipse aderis; Hec. 25, in deterrendo operam sumere; 38, in experiundo ut essem; Ad. 24, in agendo partem ostendent; 858, in experiundo ut repudies; 869, contrivi in quaerundo vitam; 900, in adparando consumunt diem; Acc. 259, quanta in venando affecta est laetitudine! Enn. Ann. 293, non in sperando cupide rem prodere summam; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 22, 3, ne quid in consulendo advorsi eveniat.

4. With *pro*: Aul. 456, pro vapulando aps te mercedem petam.

THE SUPINE.

THE SUPINE IN -UM.¹

The supine in -um is by origin the accusative of a verbal noun, used in the same terminal sense as the accusative of place names and some other words. Ordinarily we have the statement that the supine in -um is used after verbs of motion to express purpose. While a large proportion of all instances of the supine in -um are so used, yet the following material will show that it occurs with many other verbs than those strictly denoting motion. In many cases also the notion of purpose is not pronounced, e.g. *dare nuptum*. With *eo* and its compounds the supine forms a sort of periphrastic conjugation, e.g. And. 134, *quor te is perditum*? The supine in -um of transitive verbs is freely construed with an object. The following examples are arranged according to the governing verbs with which the supine occurs.

abduco: Pseud. 520, *servitum tibi me abducito*.

abeo: Amph. 807, *cubitum hinc abiimus*; so Most. 486; Curc. 559, *exsulatum abierit*; so also Merc. 43; 593; Most. 596; Rud. 325; Trin. 535; M. G. 251, *abiit ambulatum*; Most. 989, *comissatum abiisse*; Pseud. 665, *dormitum ut abeas*; Rud. 707, *vos in aram abite sessum*; 898, *abiit piscatum*; H. T. 117, *militatum abiit*; 587, *abi deambulatum*; Eun. 600, *abeunt lavatum*; Hec. 224, *rus habitatum abii*. The three following examples have an object: Capt. 848, *piscis praestinatam abire*; M. G. 1145, *concupinam abiit oratum suam*; Rud. 1056, *abiisti erum arcessitum*.

accedo: Hec. 182, *ad eam accesserat confabulatum*.

accerso: Eun. 592, *accersitur lavatum*.

adeo: Bacch. 442, *quom adeas postulatum*.

advenio: Aul. 739, *id te oratum advenio*; Poen. 561, *servom quaesitum advenies tuom*; 765, *captatum me advenis*; Trin. 448, *neque te derisum advenio*; so Eun. 860; Truc. 270, *advenisti huc te ostentatum*; Phor. 360, *me accusatum advenit*; Phor. 388, *temptatum advenis*; Acc. 198, *Thyestes Atreum adtractatum advenit*.

advento: Aul. 145, *ted id monitum advento*.

¹ Schmalz, Synt. und Stil⁴, p. 464 ff.

aufugio: Pseud. 1035, ut exsulatum aufugiat.

aveho: Cist. 579, avecta est peregre hinc habitatum.

commigro: Trin. 1084, is habitatum huc commigravit.

conduco: Aul. 457, coctum, non vapulatum, conductus fui.

conloco: Trin. 735, nuptum conlocet.

curro: Merc. 857, quonam illum curram quaeritatum? Stat. 11, ad amicos curret mutuatum.

devortor: Stich. 534, deos salutatum devortor domum; so Phor. 311.

do (in the phrase *nuptum dare*): Aul. 27, nuptum daret; 271; 384; 604, nuptum dari; Cas. 254; 770; Cist. 42; Pers. 383; Stich. 136; 140; 142; Trin. 713; And. 301, daturne nuptum? Phor. 720; Hec. 528; Ad. 346.

duco: Cist. 90, pompam me spectatum duxit; Poen. 20, sessum ducat.

eo:

a) The supine has an object, expressed or understood.

1) The expression is periphrastic: Aul. 247, it petitem gratiam; 736, quam ob rem me meosque perditum ires liberos; Cas. 721, si eas ereptum; so Pers. 63; Cist. 4, mi honorem ire habitum; Cure. 116, sitim sedatum it; Poen. 512, ire operam datum; Truc. 559, perditum se it; Poen. 512, ire operam datum; And. 134, quid agis? quor is te perditum? H. T. 315, laudem is quaesitum? Stat. 148, eo pri-vatum it me; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) 51, 5, quod uti prohibitum irem. In the passive: Rud. 1242, istaec videtur praeda praedatum irier; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 63, 6, in hac contumelia quae mihi factum itur. Expressions like these last paved the way for the future infinitive in *-um iri*.

2) The supine denotes purpose: Bacch. 347, amicos iit salutatum; Cas. 162, fortunas eo questum ad vicinam; Poen. 1134, oratum ierunt deam; Rud. 766, ibo aliquo quaeritatum ignem; Trin. 944, isse ad villam depromptum cibum; Eun. 892, nutricem accersitum iit; Phor. 838, ire ancillulam emptum; Hec. 77, isse percontatum adventum.

b) The supine has no object.

1) The expression is periphrastic: Bacch. 755, accubitum eat; so also 1203; Men. 225; 368; Pseud. 891; Most. 317, ibo commissatum; so 334; Stich. 775; Aul. 325, solet ire coctum; so Pseud.

845; 853; Cas. 977, imus cubitum; so 853; Pseud. 846; Cato, Agr. 5, 5; 143, 2; Cist. 37, eunt depressum; Merc. 100, discubitus imus; Aul. 302, it dormitum; so also Cure. 183; Most. 693; 705; Merc. 644, exsulatum ire; so also 884; 981; Trin. 599, ibit latrocinatum; Aul. 579, eo lavatum; so also Rud. 382; Stich. 568; H. T. 655; Merc. 83, iturum mercatum; so also 358; Cas. 86, ibit nuptum; Trin. 315, irem obambulatum; Stich. 451, ibo opsonatum; Most. 878, ire vis pastum; so also Pers. 318; Phor. 462, percontatum ibo; Catulus, 1, 5, ibimus quaesitum; Poen. 320, sacrificatum ire; Pers. 447, supplicatum eat; so also Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 80, 11.

2) The supine denotes purpose: Bacch. 1171, ire oppugnatum; M. G. 621, ire opitulatum; Pacuv. 187, ut eant gratatum; Cato, Frag. 14, 3, qui aquatum ut lignatum videntur ire.

fero: Cure. 645, me spectatum tulerat.

incedo: Poen. 10, sessum incedere.

loco: Cure. Arg. 8, nuptum locat.

migro: Hec. 589, tu rus habitatum migres!

mitto: Cure. 67, parasitum misi petitum argentum; Pers. 322, me boves mercatum misit; so Merc. Arg. 1; Stich. 196, quem arcessitum missa sum; so And. 515; Amph. 20, pater me misit ad vos oratum; so Afran. 303; Aul. 605, speculatum misit me; Cas. 440, mittere opsonatum; Cas. 543, ut eam ad te adiutum mitterem; Eun. 442, Phaedriam intro mittamus commissatum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 81, 10, praedatum misit.

pergo: M. G. 749, opsonatum pergam.

polliceor: Cas. 551, operam uxoris polliceor foras quasi catillatum.

prodeo: Rud. 295, huc prodimus pabulatum.

proficiscor: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 35, 14, proficiscor servatum illos; Merc. 939, proficiscor quaesitum.

profugio: Ad. 385, profugiet militatum.

prosilio: Trin. 216, prosilui amicum castigatum.

provoco: Eun. 442, Pamphilam cantatum provocemus.

recipio: Cure. 228, quin reciperet se huc essum.

transeo: Stich. 437, transibo hanc occupatum noctem.

trado: Asin. 661, quin tradis huc cruminam pressatum umerum?

venio:

1) With an object: Amph. 587, venis derisum dominum; so

Aul. 223; Cas. 102, huc venisti sponsam praereptum; Men. 71, venit hunc quaeritatum geminum; 230, quam ob rem venimus? :: quaesitum germanum meum; so M. G. 442; Most. 594, venisti huc te extentatum; Pseud. 804, veniunt conductum coquom; 1283, venio foedus commemoratum; Stich. 107, exquisitum mores venis; 595, venias vasa lautum; Eun. 589, venisse fucum factum mulieri; 752, quam ereptum venit; Phor. 906, id venio nuntiatum; 973, venias lautum peccatum tuom; Liv. And. Od. 8, matrem proci tum plurimi venerunt; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 15, 8, eo dicunt maternam necem expiatum venisse; Amph. 50, quam rem oratum veni.

2) Without an object: Aul. 408, veni coquinatum; 429, venimus coctum; 752, supplicatum venio; Pers. 568, venient ad te commissatum; so Rud. 1422; Rud. 111, quon furatum mox venias? so Trin. 864; Trin. 611, venit oratum; Truc. 547, huc cubitum venero; so Lucil. 418; Lucil. 24, saltatum venisse.

voco: Men. 457, essum vocantur; so Stich. 182; Men. 835, me in silvam venatum vocas; Stich. 686, commissatum volo vocari.

THE SUPINE IN *-u*.¹

The supine in *-u* is probably an original ablative in form and function. As such it appears both as an ablative of specification and in the separative use, also with *opus est*. Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 466, thinks the construction was by origin a dative. He cites in support of this view, Bacch. 62, istaec lepida sunt memoratui. This dative in *-ui*, he believes to have been supplanted very early by that in *-u* (a locative formation), and so to have come to be felt as an ablative by the Romans. But it seems much more natural to regard the forms in *-u* as entirely distinct from those in *-ui*. Passages like Bacch. 62, cited above, along with Cist. 365, me habes perditui et praedatui; Cas. 719, opsonatu redire, seem to point to an original free use of the verbal noun in *-us* in all cases. There is no reason for assuming that the ablative was not used freely at the outset, especially when we have an ablative form employed in several familiar ablative functions.

The following classification is based on the supines in actual use in Early Latin:

¹ Sjöstrand, De vi et usu supini secundi, 1891.

1. **Used as ablative of specification:** Cas. 880, *ita ridicula auditu, iteratu sunt*; M. G. 101, *optumus cultu*; Com. Incert. 47, *haud facilest defensu*; Pseud. 824, *formidolosas dictu, non essu modo*; Phor. 300, *dictu facilius*; Ad. 275, *turpe dictu*; M. G. 685, *bona uxor suave ductust*; Hec. 277, *non facilest expurgatu*; Aul. 582, *hoc factust optimum*; so Pseud. 185; Stich. 83; Cas. 625, *tanta factu modo mira vidi*; Most. 791, *hau factu facile est*; so Pers. 761; H. T. 704; Poen. 1109, *quo illud gestu faciat facilius*; Poen. 238, *modus optimum est habitu*; 288, *quod satis est habitu*; Stich. 59, *habitu hau probust*; Phor. 456, *turpe inceptust*; Trin. 679, *facilest inventu*; Cist. 229, *miserum memoratu*; Hec. 296, *facile scitu*. Many of the foregoing uses, it must be admitted, approach in function the value of the infinitive.

2. **With *opus est*:** H. T. 941, *ita dictu opus est*.

3. **As ablative of separation:** Cas. 719, *redit tandem opsonatu*; so also Men. 277; 288; Cato, Agr. 5, 5, *primus cubitu surgat*.

THE PERIPHRASTIC CONJUGATIONS.¹

1. **The periphrastic conjugation formed by combining the future active participle with the verb *sum*.** In general there is little to note under this head. The usage in Early Latin agrees in all essential details with that of the later classical period. Thus the periphrastic conjugation may denote:

a) An intended act: Asin. 357, *ille in balineas iturust*; Bacch. 146, *ituru's domum?* 716, *quid es facturus?* Capt. 183, *si venturu's, temperi*; 359, *si es missurus*; Cas. 831, *si daturae estis*; Cist. 153, *si tacuisset, ego eram dicturus*; 378, *quin is, si itura es?* 507, *non remissura es mihi illam?*

b) An act on the point of happening: Amph. 263, *attat, illic huc iturust*; Capt. 789, *quidnam acturust?*

c) An act destined to occur: Bacch. 510, *haec quae futura fabulor*; Cist. 243, *quae esset aetatem exactura mecum*; Trin. 55, *tua uxor quid agit?* : : *immortalis est; vivet victuraque est*.

d) A resolve: Bacch. 1003, *nam ego non laturus sum*.

e) Sometimes mere futurity: Amph. 296, *certe advenientem hic*

¹ Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 459 ff.

me hospitio pugneo accepturus est (cf. 298, hic pugnis faciet hodie ut dormiam); 665, quia domi daturus nemost prandium advenientibus; Bacch. 358, quid futurumst quom hoc reseiverit? 1087, qui fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac; Cist. 47; Hec. 567, nam ut hic laturus hoc siet. See Tammelin, De participiis, p. 75.

For the future active participle in the future infinitive, see above, p. 367 f.

2. The periphrastic conjugation formed by combining the gerundive with the verb *sum*. Here again there is substantial agreement between the usage of the early and classical periods. Thus the meaning may be that a thing must be done, deserves to be done, ought to be done, is advisable, appropriate, etc., e.g. Bacch. 409, minus mirandumst; Capt. 200, indigna digna habenda sunt erus quae facit; 227, hoc agendum est; 986, quouis nihili sit faciunda gratia; Cas. 444, captandust clanculum sermo mihi; Cist. 99, nunc alia ducendast; Cas. 475, huc aures magis sunt adhibendae; 1004, censeo veniam hanc dandam; Cist. 657, faciundum est puerile officium; Curc. 111, censeo hanc appellandam anum; Cato, Agr. 2, 5, quae satis accipiunda sint, satis accipiantur; 38, ne foras sit educendus.

A few intransitive verbs are used personally in this conjugation: Epid. 74, puppis pereunda est probe; Trin. 264, Amor ignorandust procul adhibendust atque abstandust; 1159, placenda dos est.

For instances of the impersonal use of the passive periphrastic conjugation, see p. 8 f. With a direct object: Trin. 869, agitantumst vigilias.

3. The present participle combined with the verb *sum*.¹ We find several well-marked instances in Early Latin in which the present participle with *sum* forms a genuine periphrastic combination. In other cases it is difficult to determine whether we have a periphrastic combination or whether the participle is merely a predicate adjective. In the genuinely periphrastic combinations no satisfactory theory of difference between *ferens sum* and *fero* has been proposed. The material: Amph. 132, quouis cupiens maxumest; so M. G. 997, quae huius cupiens corporist; Poen. 660, ille est cupiens; Cist. 28, suarum opum nos volunt esse indigentes; Rud. 943, tui sermonis sum

¹ Tammelin, De participiis praeae Latinitatis, p. 70 ff.

indigens; Capt. 925, te carens dum hic fui; Curc. 292, quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermipolio; Most. 141, optigere illam neglegens fui; Phor. 271, ex qua re minus rei foret aut famae temperans; 394, primus esses progeniem vostram usque ab avo proferens. Less clearly periphrastic are the following: Poen. 1038, ut tu sis sciens; so also And. 508; 775; CIL, i, 196, 23, utei scientes essetis; Bacch. 439, magistro desinebat esse dicto oboediens. The same expression occurs also M. G. 806; 1129; Pers. 378, futura es dicto oboediens? Poen. 448. Amph. 989, ego sum Iovi dicto audiens; so 991; Pers. 399; 836; Trin. 1062; Truc. 125; Cato, Agr. 142; Bacch. 459, opsequens oboediensque est mori atque imperiis patris; so also Curc. 258; Merc. 150; 158; Most. 205; Pers. 181; H. T. 259; Hec. 459. Tammelin is inclined to recognize merely predicate adjectives in all the expressions of this second class (*sciens sis, oboediens est; dicto audiens est; opsequens est*).

For the periphrastic uses of the perfect passive participle with *do, reddo, habeo, teneo*, etc., see above, p. 438 f. For the periphrastic use of the supine with *eo*, see p. 454.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SENTENCE-QUESTION.¹

THIS chapter is devoted to a consideration of the various types of the sentence-question so far as these have not already received treatment in the previous pages.² In the main I have followed the classification, and presented the results, of Morris in the paper cited below, merely adding such slight material from the other Early Latin writers (chiefly the dramatists) as was necessary for completeness.

A. Questions Introduced by *-ne*.

1. *-ne* appended to the verb (611).

a) Present Indicative.

1) First Person.

sumne (12), e.g. Merc. 588, sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere? Men. 852, sumne mulier misera, quae illaec audio? Most. 362; Rud. 1184; Pers. 75; 474. *Sumne* is especially common in soliloquy, where it always has the force of *nonne sum*?

habeon: Stich. 566, habeon rem pactam? So also Trin. 500.

novin: Epid. 550, novin ego te?

possumne: Eun. 712, possumne ego hodie ex te exsculpere verum?

repeton: Ad. 136, repeton quem dedi? where *-ne* has the force of *num*.

teneone: H. T. 407.

¹ Morris, On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence, reprinted from the Amer. Jour. Phil. x; xi; Holtze, Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum, ii, p. 236 ff.; Kühner, Ausführliche lat. Gramm. ii, p. 989 ff.; Dräger, Historische Syntax, i, p. 333 ff.

² For example, important types of the present and future indicative in sentence-questions have been considered at p. 21 ff.; p. 40; and types of the subjunctive in the sentence-question at p. 180 ff.

videon: Epid. 635, videon ego Telestidem? So also Stich. 582; Eun. 724; Hec. 81; Phor. 50; 177.

vincon: Amph. 433, vincon argumentis te non esse Sosiam?

Besides the instances of *sumne* in soliloquy, other examples of those above cited exhibit *-ne* with the force of *nonne*, e.g. Amph. 433; Eun. 712.

For the use of the present first singular with future force in sentence-questions, see p. 22 ff.

2) Second Person. Many of the questions cited under this head have a distinct imperative force, a class of uses to which attention has been called above, p. 25. A few examples occur in which *-ne* has the force of *nonne*.

ain (41):

With dependent infinitive (11), e.g. Epid. 717, ain tu te illius invenisse filiam? :: inveni; Most. 964; 974; Hec. 415; Ad. 517, ain patrem hinc abisse rus? As the emphasis is often upon the fact asserted, *ain* tends to become merely an introductory particle, like Eng. 'say!' This is indicated by the answer *inveni* in Epid. 717; similarly Truc. 193; Ad. 517.

Followed by a question with a verb of saying or thinking (4), e.g. Amph. 284, ain vero, verbero? deos esse tui similis putas? Capt. 892; Cas. 397. These usually imply a somewhat contemptuous rejection.

With repetition of a preceding phrase, either with or without the verb (13), e.g. Amph. 1088, geminos peperit filios :: ain tu? geminos? So Most. 383; 640; H. T. 1014; Epid. 699, lubuit . . . :: ain tu? lubuit? So Pers. 29a; 491; And. 875; Eun. 392. In most examples of this type *ain* is hardly more than an interjection. Morris compares the New England expression, "You don't say!"

ain tu (vero, tandem)? without any repeated phrase (13), e.g. Amph. 344, ain vero? :: aio enim vero; Aul. 298, ain tandem; Pers. 184; H. T. 890, ain tu? Com. Incert. 31, ain tandem, leno? Eun. 567; 803; Phor. 373. In this type also, *ain* is usually a mere interjection.

"*Ain* never refers forward (as *quid ais?* does) to what is about to be said, but always backward to what has been said."¹

¹ Morris, p. 8.

audin (46): "This may refer backward to what has been said, always by some third speaker, or forward to what the speaker is about to say."¹

Referring backward (22), e.g. Amph. 755, audin illum? Most. 821, audin 'fuerant' dicere? Poen. 999; Asin. 447, audin quae loquitur? M. G. 1222; And. 342, audin tu illum? Eun. 1037, audin quid ait? Most. 625, audin?

Referring forward (24), e.g. Asin. 116, audin tu? apud Archibulum ero; Men. 254; Poen. 408; 1006; Hec. 78, audin quid dicam? si quaeret me, dicas!

The frequency of this phrase tends to make it formulaic, approaching often the value of an interjection.

censen (11), e.g.: Aul. 309, censen talentum magnum exorari pote ab istoc sene? Merc. 461; And. 256, censen me verbum potuisse ullum proloqui? Eun. 217; Hec. 662.

cognoscin: Poen. 1130, cognoscin Giddenenem, ancillam tuam? Amph. 822. In both these *-ne* is equivalent to *nonne*.

credin: Capt. 961, credin pudeat quom autumes? Poen. 441; Eun. 812, credin? 852.

deridesne: Curc. 392, quaeso, deridesne me? 18.

esne: Men. 1109, esne tu Suracusanus? Pers. 581.

faterin: Capt. 317, faterin eadem quae hic fassust mihi?

haben, habetin (7), e.g.: Bacch. 269, habetin aurum? Pseud. 1163, haben argentum? Truc. 680; Eun. 674, haben hominem?

iubesne: Eun. 389.

meministine: Epid. 554; Asin. 333; Pseud. 1089; H. T. 626; Phor. 224; Trag. Incert. 193; at times with the force of *nonne*.

negasne: Poen. 777, negasne apud te esse aurum?

novistine (17), Bacch. 837, novistine hominem? So also Curc. 423; Epid. 503; Men. 748; H. T. 180; Eun. 328; 349; Phor. 63; Ad. 177; 573; at times with the force of *nonne*.

perdormiscin: Men. 928, perdormiscin tu usque ad lucem?

pergin (23), e.g. Amph. 349, pergin argutarier; Asin. 477; Eun. 817, pergin, scelestas, mecum perplexe loqui? H. T. 237; Ad. 853.

potesne: Poen. 309, potesne mi auscultare?

¹ Morris, p. 8.

rerin: Bacch. 1127, rerin ter in anno tu posse has tonsitari?
scin, scitin (55).

With direct object: Epid. 207, scin tu istuc? Ad. 581.

With infinitive (6), e.g. Amph. 1082, scin me tuom esse
erum Amphitruonem? Poen. 879; Eun. 744, scin tu turbam hanc
propter te esse factam?

With indirect question in the subjunctive (4), e.g. Men.
530, scin quod hoc sit spinter? Trin. 373; Eun. 437, scin te ut male
urat?

scin quid with the indicative (15), e.g. Men. 677, scin quid
est, quod ego ad te venio? 1154; Eun. 338, scin quid ego te volebam?
H. T. 494; Hec. 753.

scin quid with dependent deliberative (5), e.g. Pers. 154,
sed scin quid facias? M. G. 1034. In this and the preceding type,
scin sinks to the level of an empty formula.

scin quam, quo pacto, quo modo, ut, with indicative or sub-
junctive (10), e.g. Pers. 139, scin quam potest? Poen. 1319; Amph.
671, scin quam bono animo sim? Bacch. 594. These expressions
are used to pave the way for explanations uttered in "an exagger-
ated tone of correction" (Morris, p. 15).

scin quo modo (quam, quem ad modum, quouis modi, quid),
without verb (12), e.g. Amph. 356, at scin quo modo; Aul. 307;
H. T. 738, at scin quid? Phor. 111; Eun. 1063. These expressions
are likewise corrective of what has preceded.

scin tu? alone: only Rud. 382, scin tu? etiam qui it
lavatum. . . .

sentin: Com. Incert. 45, sentin senem esse tactum xxx
minis?

sponden (7), e.g. Aul. 256, sponden ergo? Capt. 898; Trin.
1157; Com. Incert. 15.

stasne: Cas. 750.

tenesne: H. T. 778.

valen: Trin. 50.

viden, videtin (50).

With direct object (13), e.g. Bacch. 834, viden convivium?
1161; Most. 829; Epid. 221; Rud. 253; Turp. 102; Com. Incert. 13,
videsne haec?

With infinitive (10), e.g. Capt. 595, *viden tu illi maculari corpus totum maculis?* Poen. 979; And. 616; Eun. 241. In these *-ne* has the force of *nonne*.

With dependent clause introduced by *ut, quam, quid* (26), e.g. Cure. 160, *viden ut anus tremula medicinam facit?* Acc. 303, *viden ut te inpietas stimulat nec moderat metus?* Turp. 103, *viden ut fastidit mei?* 104; Afran. 91; Asin. 636; Bacch. 492; 1130; Eun. 265; 783.

viden? alone (5), e.g. Capt. 304, *sed viden?* H. T. 252.

vin, voltis (60):

With accusative (6), e.g. Cure. 313, *vin aquam?* Rud. 1328.

With the infinitive (28), e.g. Men. 141, *vin tu facinus luculentum inspicere?* Merc. 769; Poen. 159; 161; H. T. 585; Phor. 807; Ad. 906; Amph. 769, *vin proferri pateram?* Asin. 646; Men. 653; Phor. 811; Ad. 969; Merc. 462, *vin me tecum illo ire?* 485; H. T. 624; Hec. 725; Phor. 810.

With the present subjunctive (26), e.g. Capt. 360, *vin vocem huc ad te?* Merc. 486; 722; M. G. 335; Most. 322; Trin. 59; Phor. 102, *voltisne eamus?* Eun. 894; Hec. 787.

vivisne: Rud. 243, *vivisne, opsecro?*

3) Third Person. These present few features calling for extended comment. The material is as follows: *amatne*, Epid. 64; *cognoscitne*, Eun. 915; *daturne*, And. 301; *doletne*, Pseud. 155; *egetne*, Trin. 330; *estne*, Truc. 188; so also Poen. 797; Rud. 1130; H. T. 454; Eun. 361; Ad. 569; often in soliloquy, as Bacch. 534, *estne hic meus sodalis?* So Cure. 230; Poen. 1299; And. 801; Eun. 848; *fertne*, Bacch. 322; *foetetne*, Asin. 928; *licetne*, Cas. 457; Cure. 401; Hec. 873; And. 893; M. G. 501; *paenitetne*, Truc. 533; *scitne*, Pseud. 745; *soletne*, Stat. 164; *solentne*, Turp. 130; *valetne*, Truc. 189; *vivitne*, Capt. 282; 989; H. T. 660; *vivontne*, Phor. 749.

Questions in the 3d sing. in which *-ne* is equivalent to *nonne*: Amph. 526, *facitne ut dixi?* And. 17, *faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant?* Most. 625; Epid. 622, *estne ita ut dixi?* Amph. 780; Pers. 225; Phor. 896.

b) Imperfect Indicative: only Pseud. 1181, *conveniebatne?* Hec. 157, *ibatne?* Eun. 698, *norasne eum prius?*

c) Future Indicative.

1) First Person: M. G. 1242, *adibon*? Stich. 428, *ad cenam ibone*? And. 612, *negabon*?

2) Second Person: Bacch. 883, *dabin*? So also Pseud. 117; 536; 1077; Pseud. 1224, *auferen*? Epid. 148, *patierin*? So Cist. 500; Phor. 518, *poterin*? Stich. 612, *ibisne*?

3) Third Person: Most. 580, *reddeturne igitur faenus*?

d) Perfect Indicative.

1) First Person (24), e.g. Amph. 823, *cenavin*? Epid. 703, *dedin*? so Truc. 935; Bacch. 856, *dixin*? Cist. 295; Eun. 691, *emin*? Cas. 170, *iussin*? So also Asin. 424; 425; 426; Bacch. 561, *misine*? Pseud. 977, *scivin*? Ad. 178, *tetigin*? H. T. 563, *vidin*? Capt. 703, *votuin*?

"In nearly all these cases there is a perfectly clear *nonne* effect" (Morris, p. 23), but Cist. 295 is a question for information, while Ad. 178, *tetigin* is equivalent to *num tetigi*?

2) Second Person (54), e.g. *accepistin*, Truc. 791; *adduxtin*, Capt. 1016; Phor. 568; *adnuistin*, Stich. 224; *audivistin*, Amph. 748; And. 785; *aufugistin*, Eun. 851; *cenavistin*, Cure. 18; *convenistin*, Pseud. 1079; *dedistin*, Trin. 129; *dixtin*, Most. 552; Eun. 793; Hec. 451; *emistin*, Trin. 124; *fuistin*, Capt. 628; *inconciliastin*, Trin. 136; *intellextin*, And. 201; Eun. 768; *iuravistin*, Pseud. 352; *perdidistin*, Cure. 584; *promistin*, Cure. 709. So also Rud. 1384; *sensistin*, Hec. 316; *surrupuistin*, Men. 507; *tetigistin*, Most. 457; 461; *valuistin*, Amph. 679; Trin. 50; *vidistin*, Amph. 616; M. G. 546; Eun. 350; Ad. 400; Titin. 120. In Eun. 793, *dixtin*, and Pseud. 352, *iuravistin*, the *-ne* question has the force of *nonne*. Compound forms: Bacch. 803, *loquitatusne es*? M. G. 558, *ratun es*?

3) Third Person (11): *accepitne*, Bacch. 250; *caruitne*, Cure. 17; *convenitne*, M. G. 1105; *fuitne*, Capt. 633; Trin. 106; *habuitne*, Trin. 330; *peperitne*, Truc. 504; *rettulitne*, Asin. 444; *venitne*, Bacch. 247; Truc. 931; Pseud. 1067.

"Some of these, Trin. 106; Capt. 633; Truc. 931, have some *nonne* effect though it is not absolutely necessary to take any of them so" (Morris, p. 25). Compound forms: Merc. 202, *visun est*? M. G. 462, *visan est*?

e) Present Subjunctive: And. 639, *adeamne*? Phor. 186, *loquarne*? Hec. 442, *maneamne*? Trin. 952, *noverisne*? Merc. 518, *possin*?

f) Imperfect Subjunctive: Capt. 714, *essetne?* so also Trin. 178.

g) Perfect Subjunctive: Merc. 301, *aussimne?*

h) Infinitive: Men. 795, *servirin tibi postulas viros?*

i) Periphrastic Conjugations: Poen. 432, *abiturun es?* Most. 62, *ervom daturin estis?* Atta, 1, *daturin estis aurum?* Eun. 462, *ituran quopiam es?* Cas. 610, *missurusne es ad me uxorem tuam?* Hec. 661, *mirandumne id est?*

2. *-ne* appended to pronouns (384).

a) *egone* (89).

1) With the indicative (8), e.g. Amph. 747, *egon istuc dixi?* 743; Bacch. 806; Men. 389; Phor. 999.

2) With the subjunctive in repudiating questions and exclamations (81); see p. 188 ff. At times we find *egone* alone without a verb, e.g. Asin. 900, *ecquid matrem amas?* :: *egone illam?* 609; Cas. 243; Merc. 317; 323; M. G. 1139; Truc. 898; And. 504; Eun. 65; 757.

b) *tune* (88).

1) With the indicative (69), e.g. Merc. 305, *tun capite cano amas?* Curc. 419, *tun is es?* Capt. 572; Men. 305; Pseud. 978; And. 910, *tune in fraudem inlicis?* Hec. 549; Most. 331, *tune ais?* Capt. 571; Amph. 373, *tun audes dicere?* Bacch. 1163; 822, *tun autumas?* Ad. 924, *tun iubes?* Acc. 417, *tun dia Mede's?* 491, *tun socium mittis leto?* Imperfect: Hec. 340, *tun hic eras?* Eun. 86; Phor. 945. Future: Asin. 106, *tun redimes me?* Stat. 14, *tun iam callebis?* Rud. 748. Perfect: Amph. 717, *tun heri hunc salutavisti?* Most. 369, *tutin vidisti?* Trin. 1179; Ad. 638, *tune has pepulisti fores?* Pluperfect: Phor. 613, *tun dixeras huic?*

2) With the subjunctive (11). These are mostly repudiating questions and exclamations. Present: Asin. 628; 700; Aul. 756; Cas. 111; M. G. 497; Pers. 135; 295; And. 910; Eun. 808; see p. 188. Imperfect: Phor. 932 (conditional). Perfect: Amph. 818, *tun mecum fueris!* p. 189.

3) Without verb (8), e.g. Asin. 230; Merc. 158; H. T. 343; Hec. 862; Ad. 127.

Even in the indicative the idea of rejection or repudiation is usually marked in questions introduced by *tune*.

c) *-ne* with other forms of the personal pronouns (54).

1) *men* (24), e.g. Men. 606, *men rogas?* So also Epid. 98; H. T. 246. Other verbs: Men. 786; Poen. 399; Ad. 543; And. 908; Phor. 448. Without verb: Stich. 254; Trin. 69; And. 450; Hec. 692; 748.

2) *mene* (abl.): Poen. 368, *mene ego illaec patiar praesente dici?*

3) *mein*: Stich. 334, *mein fastidis (mihi in, codd.)*; so also Titin. 93 (*mei, codd.*).

4) *mihin* (12), e.g. Cure. 571, *mihin malum minitare?* Men. 868. Without verb, Cure. 422; Stich. 635; And. 476; 849; 850; Hec. 523.

5) *ten* (9), e.g. Rud. 235, *ten, Palaestra, audio?* Asin. 94, *ten ego defrudem?* Asin. 700; 669; 697. These are chiefly repudiating questions. Without verb: Merc. 504; Eun. 218.

6) *tibine*: H. T. 102, *tibine haec diutius licere speras facere?* Without verb: Pers. 721; Eun. 577.

7) *nosne*: Poen. 1238; And. 804.

8) *vosne*: Stich. 132, *vosne ego patiar cum mendicis nuptas!* 135, *vosne latrones magni penditis?*

d) Possessive pronouns with *-ne* (21).

1) *meus* (9), e.g. Bacch. 842, *meamne hic Mnesilochus ut retineat mulierem!* Capt. 853; Rud. 839. Without verb: Cure. 357, *meosne amores!* Phor. 198.

2) *noster*: Trin. 512, *nostramne vis nutricem abalienare?* Ad. 330.

3) *tuos* (9), e.g. Capt. 845, *tuan causa aedis incensurum censes?* Pers. 338; 747; Eun. 428, *tuomne hoc dictum erat?* Without verb: Epid. 688; Ad. 400.

4) *suos*: And. 932, *suamne esse aibat?*

Many of these questions with possessive pronouns have a strong tone of repudiation.

e) Demonstrative pronouns with *-ne* (132).

1) *hicine* (48), e.g. Amph. 514, *hoccin placet?* Most. 10, *em, hocine volebas?* 25; 26; 27; Trin. 186; H. T. 1029, *hocine quae-sisti?* Phor. 1012; Hec. 283; Ad. 237; Merc. 356, *hocinest amare?* And. 236; Amph. 362, *haecine tua domust?* And. 907; Hec. 771; Epid. 621, *haecinest?* 574; Pacuv. 119, *hicine is est, quem fama*

nobilitat? Acc. 96, hocinest, quod tu meam benevolentiam interis-
es ratus? Trag. Incert. 93; Lucil. 206. "Except with *est*, *hicine*
regularly introduces a rejecting exclamation" (Morris, p. 32).

2) *isticine*: in similar uses (7), e.g. Asin. 932, istoscin patrem
aequom est mores liberis largirier? Merc. 620; Pseud. 847; Eun.
830, istucine interminata sum?

3) *illicine*: Pseud. 954, illicinest? Truc. 599; H. T. 199.

4) *isne* (17), e.g. Capt. 987, isne istic fuit? Cure. 82; M. G.
532; And. 629, idne est verum? H. T. 616; Ad. 939; Cato, Frag.
(Jord.), 25, 5, idne irascimini? Lucil. 347, idne aegri est? With
subjunctive: And. 263, ein ego ut advorser! Trin. 961.

5) Other pronominal forms (59), e.g. Merc. 203, illamne, obse-
cro? Eun. 356, illumne, obsecro, inhonestum hominem? Pseud.
205, illine audeant! Trin. 987, is ipsusne es? 988; 902, ab ipson
istas accepisti? Capt. 154, nullumne interea nactu's? H. T. 1006,
nullamne ego rem umquam volui? Bacch. 479; And. 247; Stich.
260; Truc. 285; Hec. 323, nemon medicum adduxit? Phor. 152;
Asin. 933, nilne te pudet? Pers. 424; Pseud. 78; Pacuv. 34,
nilne ad te de iudicio armum accidit? 318; Trag. Incert. 245; Stat.
16, nihilne, nil tibi esse quod edim? Atta, 7; Ad. 528. Without
verb: And. 435, nilne? Bacch. 421, eademne erat disciplina tibi?
H. T. 75, tantumne est oti tibi? Hec. 813; Trin. 609; Stat. 217.

"With certain limitations, all pronominal questions refer back-
ward, taking up some previous idea, which may have been distinctly
expressed or merely implied, and repeating it in an exclamatory way,
so as to suggest that it is untenable. . . . The limitations are these:
sentences with *est* are regularly for information, when they are asked
about some definite person or thing. Pronouns used alone do not
ask for information and are exclamatory, but do not necessarily
express rejection. Especially after questions they indicate only
doubt or mild surprise. Pronouns which approach adjectives most
nearly, e.g. *nullus*, *tantus*, *idem*, seem to have the least rejecting force,
and sometimes lack it entirely" (Morris, p. 33).

3. *-ne* appended to nouns (35).

a) With verb (23), e.g. Pers. 26, disne advorser! Turp. 71, vinon
(non, *codd*) invitat plusculum sese, ut solet? Pers. 584, opusne est?
M. G. 663, opusne erit? 664.

b) Without verb (12), e.g. Epid. 30, *armane*?

4. *-ne* appended to adjectives and participles (60). "Questions of this form are for the most part regular. The adjective is generally in the nominative. Of other cases, Plautus has only *bonan fide* (3), *bellan specie*, *pro lignean salute* (Pseud. 47), *tribusne*, *alienon*, *omnene* (acc.), *omnian* (2). Terence has *pro certon*, *multon*, *rufamne*, *duasne*, *binan*, *bonan*. In the nominative Plautus has: *alienus*, *certum* (7), *dives*, *dignus*, *exspectatus*, *insanus*, *malus*, *molestus*, *sanus* (16), *relictus*, *tenax*, *verus*. Terence has: *certum*, *dubium*, *sanus* (2) *salva*" (Morris, p. 34). I have noted also the following examples: Stat. 158, *sed tua morosane uxor est*? 188, *liberne es*? Turp. 117, *sanusne es, qui temere lamentere*?

5. *-ne* appended to adverbs (278).

a) Local adverbs (10), e.g. Aul. 335, *huccine detrusti me ad senem parcellissimum*? M. G. 181, *Philocomasium hicine etiam nunc est*? Trin. 1079; Ad. 183, *hicine libertatem aiunt esse aequam omnibus*? Rud. 110, *isticine vos habitatis*?

b) *adeon* (6), e.g. And. 277, *adeon me ignavom putas*? 278; Phor. 1040; Hec. 547. These are repudiating.

c) *sicine* (15), Asin. 127, *sicine hoc fit*? Merc. 158; Rud. 251; H. T. 166, *sicine est sententia*? Eun. 99. These are all repudiating.

d) *iamne* (40).

1) 1st sing. e.g. Curc. 132, *iamne dico*? Curc. 214; Eun. 492, *iamne imus*? Stat. 34, *iamne adeo*?

2) 2d person (sing. and plu.), e.g. Rud. 584, *iamne abis*? so Most. 991; Poen. 678, *iamne itis*? Aul. 819, *iamne autem, ut soles*? So Bacch. 203 and elsewhere; Amph. 485, *iamne hoc scitis*? Poen. 116, *iamne hoc tenetis*? Ad. 186, *iamne me vis dicere*? Truc. 634, *iamne abiisti*? H. T. 848, *iamne oblitus es*? Liv. And. Trag. 7, *iamne oculos specie laetavisti optabili*? Pseud. 1126, *iamne illum comessurus es*?

3) 3d person (sing. and plu.), e.g. Curc. 50, *iamne ea fert iugum*? Eun. 550, *iamne erumpere hoc licet mi gaudium*? Men. 333, *iamne, abiit*? 550; 876, *iamne isti abierunt*?

e) *etiamne* (27).

1) Without time-force, e.g. Amph. 760, *etiamne hoc negabis*? Asin. 40; Most. 272; H. T. 742, *etiamne tecum hic res mihi*?

Eun. 143; Phor. 238; Naev. Com. 87, *etiamne* (*etiam se, codd*) *audent mecum una apparere?*

2) Meaning 'still,' 'yet,' e.g. Most. 522, *etiamne astas?* Men. 710; Rud. 846; Phor. 774, *etiamne id dubiumst?*

3) In sentences equivalent to an imperative, e.g. Most. 937, *etiamne aperis?* 938; Poen. 431, *etiamne abis?* Rud. 467, *etiamne hanc urnam acceptura's?* Similarly Cas. 977, *etiamne imus?* (= *eamus*).

f) *itane* (50).

1) *itane* alone referring backward to what has been said, e.g. M. G. 1278; Pers. 291; H. T. 887; Eun. 1058. *itane vero*: Curc. 725. With a question following, Merc. 919; Rud. 747; Phor. 392.

2) With a verb, referring backward, and so having a definite standard of comparison, e.g. Men. 948, *itane censes?* Poen. 660, *itane ille est cupiens?* And. 399, *itane credis?* Eun. 76; Stat. 30; 31.

3) *itane* followed by a clause of result, e.g. Bacch. 477, *itane oportet rem mandatam gerere, ut mulierem teneat sedens?* And. 916, *itane adtemperate evenit ut hodie veniret?* Eun. 240.

4) With the standard of comparison so indefinite that *itane* seems to have become weakened into a mere interrogative particle (only in Terence): And. 926, *itane vero obturbat?* Phor. 315; 536; 231.

g) *satin* (93).

1) *satis* retains its original sense and the questions are frequently answered by *satis*.

With *est*, e.g. Men. 616, *satin hoc est tibi?* Phor. 210, *satin est?* Phor. 683, *satin est id?*

With *habes* or *est* and conditional clause, e.g. Amph. 509, *satin habes, si feminarum nullast quam aequae diligam?* Most. 389; Phor. 856, *satine est, si te delibutum gaudio reddo?*

With adjectives, e.g. Amph. 604, *satin tu sanus es?* so Men. 510; Ad. 937; Ad. 329, *satin hoc certumst?* Pers. 183; Cas. 897.

With adverbs, e.g. Amph. 578, *satin hoc plane, satin diserte esse nunc videor tibi locutus?* And. 804, *satin recte?* Trin. 1177; Pers. 18, *satin ergo ex sententia?*

With perfect participles, e.g. Bacch. 1202, *satin ego istuc habeo offirmatum?* M. G. 574.

With verbs, e.g. Men. 602, *satin audis quae illic loquitur?* Most. 831, *satin habes* (= *intellegis*); Poen. 171; Ad. 402, *satin scis ibi esse?* Acc. Trag. 475, *satin astu et fallendo callet?* Enn. Ann. 257.

"In the examples above given there is a gradual weakening of meaning. . . . From 'enough for this definite purpose or occasion,' *satis* comes to mean 'enough for practical purposes,' 'enough for ordinary occasions,' 'well enough.' We have the same tendency illustrated in English 'enough,' and perhaps more clearly in 'quite' as used in America. With this loss of definite standard, there goes also a loss of definite construction in the sentence; *satis* affects the whole sentence rather than any single word in it." (Morris, p. 38).

2) *satis* does *not* retain its original sense and an answer with *satis* is not possible, as it is in the examples cited under 1), e.g. Most. 76, *satin abiit, neque quod dixi flocci existumat?* Capt. 653; Epid. 666; Men. 522; Merc. 337; M. G. 393; 999; Poen. 919; Rud. 462; Truc. 553. "In these questions the weakening of *satis* has gone still further, until the original idea of standard of comparison is wholly lost and *satis* has come to mean 'really,' 'actually'" (Morris, p. 39). In the following instances an exclamatory *ut* accompanies *satis*: M. G. 1134, *satin ut commoditas usquequaque me adiuvat!* Men. 181, *satin ut occaecatust prae huius corporis candoribus!* Merc. 481; Pers. 658; Stich. 271; Bacch. 491, *satin ut quem tu habeas fidelem nescias!* Acc. 98; Turp. 87, *satine ut se meum cor voluptatibus dat?*

h) Other adverbs (37), e.g. *advorsum, bene* (3), *certo* (3), *certe* (3), *facile, hodie, ilico, itidem, male, modo* (2), *numquam* (3), *nuncin, perpetue, plane, potius, prius, recte, serio, tam (tamine), vero* (3), *usque* (2), *salve*.

6. *potin* (35).

a) For *potin* with subjunctive alone, the subjunctive with *ut*, with *ne*, and with *ut ne*, see p. 237.

b) *potin* with the infinitive: Cure. 246, *potin coniecturam facere?* Cist. 231; Poen. 1089; Trin. 759; And. 437, *potin es mihi verum dicere?* Eun. 101, *potin est hic tacere?*

7. *nonne* (30; in Plautus always before a vowel):¹ Amph. 404, *nonne hac noctu nostra navis huc ex portu Persico venit? nonne huc me erus misit meus? nonne ego nunc sto ante aedis nostras? . . . nonne hic modo me pugnīs contudit?* 452, *nonne erae meae nuntiare, quod erus meus iussit licet?* 539, *nonne ego possum, furcifer, te perdere?* 625, *quaeso, nonne intellegis?* Cure. 552, *nonne eis crederem?* Merc. 880, *caelum ut est splendore plenum nonne ex advorso vides?* Trin. 1046, *nonne hoc animum advorti?* Pers. 747, *nonne antestaris?* Pseud. 1322, *nonne audes aliquam partem mihi gratiam facere hinc de argento?* Trin. 789, *nonne arbitraris adulescentem anuli paterni signum novisse?* Amph. 165, *nonne idem hoc luci me mittere potuit?* And. 238, *nonne oportuit praescisse me ante?* 239; 647; 869; H. T. 545, *nonne aliquam fabricam fingit?* 922; Eun. 165, *nonne quaesivi?* 334; 736; Phor. 768; Hec. 552; Ad. 660, *nonne haec iusta tibi videtur poscere?* Pacuv. 16, *nonne hinc vos propere amolimini?* 129, *nonne officium fungar vulgi atque aegre male factum feram?* Acc. 288, *nonne Argivos fremere bellum et velle vim volgas vides?* Fannius (Meyer), p. 221, *nonne illos omnia occupaturos putatis?* Truc. 267, *nonne ego videor?*

As may be seen from the above material, *nonne*-questions are infrequent in Early Latin, *non* being the regular particle instead of *nonne*. Some have even denied the use of *nonne* in Plautus and Terence; see Morris, p. 41.

8. *-ne* appended to relatives (20). Sentences of this kind fall into classes, according as the antecedent is or is not expressed.

a) The antecedent is not expressed, e.g. Most. 738, *ventus navem nostram deseruit. :: quid est? quo modo? :: pessumo. :: quaene subducta erat tuto in terra?* Cure. 705, *ne quisquam a me argentum auferat. :: quodne promisti?* Amph. 697; Epid. 719; M. G. 13; Rud. 861; 1019; 1231; Truc. 506; And. 768, *quemne ego heri vidi ad vos adferri?* Phor. 923. The following have the subjunctive: Rud. 767, *ignem magnum faciam. :: quin inhumanum exuras tibi?* Trin. 360.

b) The relative clause precedes the leading clause, and the antecedent is either expressed or plainly implied: Stich. 501, *quaene*

¹ See Schrader, *De particularum -ne, anne, nonne*, 1885 (Diss. Phil. Argentorat. viii, p. 296 ff.), p. 42 ff.

eapse deciens in die mutat locum, eam auspicavi ego in re capitali mea? Rud. 272, quae ne eiectae e mari sumus ambae, opseco, unde nos hostias agere voluisti huc? M. G. 614, quod ne vobis placeat, displiceat mihi? Morris includes also Cist. 675.

9. -ne appended to conjunctions: Merc. 573, pervorse facis? :: quod ne amem? Most. 1132, ego ibo pro te. :: verbero, etiam inrides? :: quia ne me pro te ire ad cenam autumo? Pers. 851; M. G. 1005, iam adlubescit primulum :: prius ne quam illam oculis vidisti? Truc. 694.

10. Appended to interrogative words: Trin. 1095, qualine amico mea commendavi bona?

Attention has been frequently called above to *ne*-questions used with the force of *nonne*-questions. By those who connect the interrogative *-ne* with the negative *ne*, such sentences are regarded as exhibiting the survival of the original force of *-ne*. But it seems safer to dissociate *-ne* from negative *ne*; *-ne* is more likely to have been connected with asseverative *ne* (Glöckner, in Wölfflin's Archiv, xi, p. 491 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 618). *-ne*-questions, therefore, seem to have been originally neutral in character. It was the context and intonation that suggested in each case the character of the answer expected.

B. Questions Introduced by *num*, *numnam*, *numne*, *numquis*.

With Walde (Wörterbuch), Brugmann (Kurze Vgl. Gramm. § 838), and others I regard *num* as most probably the basis of *nunc* and so meaning originally 'now.'

1. *num* (77).

a) Sentences in which "the context shows that the speaker could not possibly have held the negative opinion or have expected a negative answer" (Morris, p. 47): Aul. 242, sed pro Iuppiter, num ego disperii; Men. 413, num istaec mulier illine (from Syracuse) venit, quae te novit tam cate :: hercle opinor; pernegari non potest; Amph. 620, num obdormivisti dudum? 709; 753; Turp. 104, viden ut osculatur cariem? num hilum illa haec pudet?

Morris recognizes 15 examples under this head for Plautus and Terence; but the bulk of these are introduced by *numnam* (for which

see below), while of the others several do not seem to me to belong here.

b) "In some cases the question is clearly asked for information" (38), e.g. Men. 620, num ancillae aut servi tibi responsant? eloquere! inpune non erit; 890, num larvatust aut cerritus? fac sciam. num eum veterus aut aqua intercus tenet? Merc. 173, obsecro, num navis periit? :: salvast navis; Asin. 29, die serio quod te rogem . . . num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit? The foregoing are distinctly neutral; in many others (see Morris, p. 48) "the context does not forbid the negative sense nor does it require it. If it is presumed on the evidence of the later usage that *num* requires a negative answer, these questions would not be inconsistent with the rule; if it can be shown that *num* is properly neutral in sense, there is nothing to prevent these cases being so understood." Examples are: Asin. 619; Aul. 161; Bacch. 212; Capt. 658; Merc. 132; Most. 336; And. 438; Eun. 756; Phor. 846; Ad. 488; Lucil. 823, num dolet? Pacuv. 241.

c) "Sentences which challenge the hearer to acknowledge something which the dialogue or the action makes evident. . . . It is not quite accurate to say that *num* here expects a negative answer. It challenges the hearer to deny if he can, but the denial is not waited for." (Morris, p. 48) (33), e.g. Capt. 632, meam rem non cures, si recte facias. num ego curo tuam? Men. 627, potin ut molestus ne sis? num te appello? Curc. 365, num moror; so Most. 794; Epid. 681; H. T. 793, num mihi datumst? num iussi? num illa oppignerare filiam meam me invito potuit? Phor. 411; 524; And. 477; 496; 578; Most. 345, num mirum aut novom quippiam facit?

2. *numnam*. In questions with *numnam* the context shows that regularly (probably always) the speaker did not hold a negative opinion or expect a negative answer: Amph. 1073, numnam hunc percussit Iuppiter? credo edepol; Aul. 389, strepitust intus. numnam ego compilor miser? Eun. 947, quae illaec turbast? numnam ego perii? Amph. 321; Cist. 658; Poen. 976; Eun. 286; H. T. 517. Separated: M. G. 924, num ille te nam novit? Truc. 352; 602.

3. *numne*. All of the instances of *numne* cited for Early Latin (Poen. 1079; Afran. 29; Naev. Com. 44) rest upon improbable conjecture.

4. numquis, numquid (107).

a) Questions asking for information (15), e.g. Most. 999, numquid processit ad forum hic hodie novi? 1031; Merc. 369, numquid tibi dolet? Eun. 272, numquidnam hic quod nolis vides? Bacch. 538; And. 943; Capt. 172, num quo foras vocatus es? Cure. 23; 25; Merc. 642; 716, numquid delinquent rustici? Men. 620; Most. 548; 750.

b) Questions expecting a negative answer (25), e.g. Asin. 830, numquidnam tibi molestumst, si haec nunc mecum accubat? Men. 1146; Pseud. 1329, numquid iratus es? :: nil profecto; Rud. 832; Eun. 994; Phor. 563, numquid est quod opera mea vobis opus sit? :: nil.

c) *numquid*, with negative effect, in questions challenging the hearer to deny an evident fact (26), e.g. Pers. 462, numquid moror? 726; Rud. 736, numqui minus hasce esse oportet liberas? M. G. 1130; Eun. 475, numquid habes quod contemnas? Ad. 689.

d) *numquid vis*? (41). In this frequent formula of leave-taking there seems to be no negative connotation. Examples: Amph. 542; 544; Bacch. 604; Trin. 192; Hec. 272; Ad. 432. Similar are Eun. 213, numquid aliud imperas; Trin. 198, numquid rogaturus? Poen. 911, numquid me morare? *num quippiam* is found in Pers. 735; Truc. 432.

Where *quid* is adverbial, *numquid* hardly differs from *num*, e.g. Pers. 551, numquid in principio cessavit dicere? Pseud. 1329; And. 943.

C. Questions Introduced by ecquis, ecquid, enumquam.

1. In the masculine and feminine, and in the neuter as subject or object, *ecquis* (barring a few exceptions to be noted below) is a colorless interrogative-indefinite (48), e.g. Amph. 856, dic mihi verum serio, ecquis alius Sosia intust? Rud. 1033, ecquem in his locis novisti? Epid. 441; M. G. 782; Truc. 508; Enn. Ann. 230, ecquid erit praemi? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 8, ecqua tandem lex est quae dicat?

In Merc. 844, ecquisnam deust qui mea nunc laetus laetitia fuat? there is an expectation of a negative answer; so also Rud. 971; Eun. 1031.

2. *ecquid* with adverbial force (28), e.g. Asin. 900, ecquid matrem

amas? Men. 146, *ecquid* *adsimulo similiter*? Most. 906, *ecquid* *placent*? And. 871, *ecquid* *te pudet*? Eun. 456. "In many of these cases *ecquid* has degenerated into an interrogative particle (cf. *numquid*). It generally has neutral effect, but like *-ne* or *num* it may be used in circumstances which admit only one answer, and so may seem to expect an affirmative or negative." (Morris, p. 54).

Upon *ecquis* in general Morris endorses the observation of Dräger, i, p. 344, that while this type of question does not have a special meaning, yet it often indicates a certain degree of importunity.

3. *enumquam*: Men. 925, *enumquam* *intestina tibi crepant*? Rud. 987, *sed tu enumquam piscatorem vidisti, venefice, vidulum piscem cepisse*? 1117; Trin. 590; Phor. 329, *en enumquam iniuriarum audisti mihi scriptam dicam*? 348.

D. Questions without Interrogative Particle.

1. Sentences whose interrogative force is slight or questionable (75).

a) Expressions (25) of the type of Aul. 397, *sed cesso priusquam prorsus perii currere*? Capt. 827, *sed ego cesso hunc Hegionem onerare laetitia*? Editors usually take these as questions (though obviously not expecting an answer). Yet some punctuate them with a period. I incline to regard them as interrogative, though unable to furnish convincing arguments in favor of this view. Other examples are Aul. 627; Epid. 342; Merc. 130; M. G. 896; Pers. 197; Truc. 630; And. 845; H. T. 410; Pacuv. 111; Acc. 519; Turp. 212.

b) Many sentences introduced by *nempe*¹ (37), e.g. Aul. 293, *nempe* *huc dimidium dicis, dimidium domum*; Asin. 116, *apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium. :: nempe in foro*? 339; Bacch. 189, *nempe recte valet? :: istuc volebam ego ex te percontarier*; 689; Cist. 600; Curc. 43, *ei ancillula est. :: nempe huic lenoni qui hic habitat*; And. 30; 194, *Davos sum, non Oedipus. :: nempe ergo aperte vis quae restant me loqui? :: sane quidem*; Eun. 563; Hec. 105. Some of these seem distinctly interrogative, as shown by the answers in Bacch. 188 and And. 194, but most of them hover between the declarative and interrogative value.

¹ Langen, Beiträge zum Plautus, p. 125 ff.

c) Sentences with *fortasse*, *fortassis*, *scilicet* (13), e.g. Amph. 726, tu me hic vidisti? :: ego, inquam . . . :: in somnis fortassis? Bacch. 671, Chrysale, occidi. :: fortassis tu auri dempsisti parum? Cure. 324; Pers. 21; 441; Rud. 142; Phor. 145, non multum habet quod det fortasse? 901; Eun. 346, comites secuti scilicet sunt virginem? H. T. 705; Phor. 695. These are of the same nature as sentences with *nempe* above mentioned.

2. Repetitions in which a speaker takes up and repeats words just used by the other person in the dialogue. The effect is exclamatory rather than interrogative (209).

a) The words are repeated without change and the verb is not expressed (52), e.g. Amph. 692, ut dudum dixeras. :: dudum? Capt. 838, cedo manum! :: manum? Merc. 736; Most. 383; And. 328, si id non potest aut tibi nuptiae haec sunt cordi, — :: cordi! H. T. 192; Ad. 700.

b) Slight changes are made in the repeated words, especially in the person of pronouns (26), e.g. Cure. 582, tuom libertum. :: meum? Men. 282; Eun. 798, ego non tangam meam? :: tuam! Hec. 209; Capt. 148, alienus . . . :: alienus ego! alienus ille! Aul. 784.

c) The verb, if it is in the 3d person, may be repeated without change, either with or without other words (25), e.g. Cure. 173, te prohibet erus. :: prohibet! Epid. 698, lubuit. :: ain tu? lubuit! Merc. 181; And. 875, ita praedicant. :: ita praedicant? H. T. 606; Ad. 934.

d) The verb may be changed in person, and other changes or additions may be made (54), e.g. Aul. 759, quod subrupuisti meum. :: surrupio ego tuom! Bacch. 681; M. G. 556; And. 617, at iam expdiam. :: expdies! H. T. 720.

e) The repeated verb is in the subjunctive (52).

1) Repetitions of an imperative, e.g. Aul. 829, i, redde aurum! :: reddam ego aurum!

2) The imperative is only implied or is expressed in the form of a question, Bacch. 627, non taces? :: taceam!

3) Repetitions of a subjunctive, e.g. Pseud. 1226, Pseudolum mihi dedas. :: Pseudolum ego tibi dedam!

4) Passages in which the rejected idea is not distinctly

expressed in a preceding utterance, e.g. Capt. 208, at fugam fingitis. :: nos fugiamus!

For full material under these last four heads, see p. 187 ff.

3. *Rogas, negas, rogitas* and similar verbs, with exclamatory force (81).

1) *rogas, rogitas, negas* alone (49), e.g. Aul. 634, quid tibi vis reddam? :: *rogas?* Epid. 64, amatne istam . . . ? :: *rogas?* Poen. 263; Trin. 80; And. 184, qua de re? :: *rogas?* 909; Ad. 558; Aul. 339, qui vero? :: *rogitas?* Rud. 1361; H. T. 631, quid ego feci? :: *rogitas?* Eun. 675; Phor. 156; Cure. 711, non commemini dicere. :: quid? *negas?* Aul. 764; Men. 306; M. G. 829; Phor. 740, estne hic Stilpo? :: non. :: *negas?*

2) *rogas, rogitas, negas* followed by other words (10), e.g. Cas. 997, *rogitas etiam?* Men. 713, *rogas me?* Eun. 653; H. T. 251, *rogitas quid sit?* Rud. 1067, *negas quod video?*

3) With a few other verbs (22), e.g. Bacch. 777, quid fit? quam mox navigo? *taces?* Hec. 527, peperit filia. Hem, *taces?* Eun. 695; 821; so also *derides*, Merc. 909; Ad. 852; *inrides*, And. 204; *narras*, H. T. 520; *cessas*: Hec. 360; 814; Turp. 1, intus *cessas?* Enn. Trag. 182, gradum proferre pedum *cessas?*

4. Questions with *non* and other negative words (202).

a) *non* in repetitions, either with or without a verb (23), e.g. And. 194, non hercle intellego. :: non? H. T. 780; Ad. 661; Epid. 482, haec non est ea. :: quid? non est? Most. 595, non dat, non debet. :: non debet? Poen. 173; H. T. 612; Hec. 342. Most of these are purely exclamatory.

b) Other questions with *non* (165).

1) *non* and the verb are at the beginning of the sentence (80), e.g. *non vides*, e.g. Asin. 472, non vides irasci? Most. 811; H. T. 1013; Acc. Trag. 608.

non tu scis, e.g. Merc. 732, non tu scis quae sit illaec? Men. 714; Amph. 703; Com. Incert. 46.

Other verbs in 2d person present indicative, e.g. Asin. 476, non audes? Pseud. 230, non audis? 612, non soles respicere te? Com. Incert. 85, non intellegis? H. T. 239, non cogitas? Stat. 183, non vis? etc. Men. 294, non nosti meum nomen? Truc. 595.

Perfect indicative, 2d person, e.g. Epid. 639, non meministi? And. 852, non tu dixisti? Afran. 97, non audisti? etc.; Rud. 355.

Impersonals, e.g. M. G. 1404, *non licet mihi dicere?* Asin. 935; *non pudet*: Men. 708; Phor. 525.

Other tenses and persons: Epid. 599, *non poteras novisse?* Eun. 696, *non dicturu's?* Merc. 750, *non estis cenaturi?* Cas. 737, *non sum liber?* Phor. 543, *non triumpho?* Hec. 360, *non sciunt ipsi viam?* Eun. 839; Phor. 804, *non norat patrem?* Hec. 341, *non visam uxorem!* For complete material illustrating the subjunctive, see p. 183; 191.

2) *non* and the verb together, but not at the beginning of the sentence; in most cases at or near the end (19).

First Person: Afran. 122, *puella non sum, supparo si induta sum?*

Second person, e.g. Epid. 514, *fides non reddis?* Eun. 463, *hunc non vides?* Men. 505, *tuom parasitum non novisti?* Aul. 772; M. G. 698, *nutrici non missuru's quicquam?* Phor. 384, *sobrinum tuom non noras?* Crassus (Meyer), p. 270, *tu imagines ipsas non perhorrescis?*

Third person, e.g. Hec. 231, *cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet?* Stat. 98, *mihi non sunt balneae?*

With subjunctive, e.g. Eun. 798, *ego non tangam?* 591.

In force the few cases just enumerated under 2) do not differ from those cited under 1).

3) *non* and the verb are separated, *non* being at the beginning, the verb generally at the end (66).

First person, e.g. Amph. 518, *non ego te novi?* so also Capt. 564; Men. 407; Afran. 253; H. T. 920, *non tibi ego exempli satis sum?* Rud. 1125; Men. 511, *non ego te foras exire vidi?* Pacuv. 149.

Second person, e.g. Pers. 385, *non tu nunc hominum mores vides?* Epid. 638, *non me novisti?* Ad. 560, *non tu eum rus hinc modo produxe aibas?* And. 921, *non tu tuom malum aequo animo feras?* Eun. 819; Hec. 603; Stat. 41, *non haec putas?* *non haec in corde vorsantur tibi?* Lucil. 242, *non hoc quid valeat cognoscas?*

Third person, e.g. Bacch. 1193, *non tibi venit in mentem?* 1000; Phor. 392, *non te horum pudet?* Hec. 236; Afran. 346

Subjunctive, e.g. Epid. 588, *non patrem ego te nominem!* Eun. 322; Trin. 133, *non ego illi argentum redderem!* Phor. 119, *non ei pater veniam daret!*

Without verb, e.g. Asin. 652, libertos. :: non patronos? And. 149.

Of the above three divisions of *non*-questions, 1) and 2) seem to be exclamatory. The third (with the verb at the end) are real questions, and are taken by Morris (p. 72) as the origin of the *nonne*-questions, which likewise are real questions and have the verb at or near the end of the sentence.

c) Other negatives used in questions without a particle (14).

1) *nil*, e.g. *nil respondes*, Poen. 259; Eun. 152; Ad. 641; other combinations: And. 949; Eun. 735; Hec. 462; Ad. 244.

2) *nullus*: Bacch. 718, Pistoclero nulla amica est? Pseud. 1002.

3) *nemo*: Ad. 529, hospes nemost vobis?

4) *neque . . . neque*: Amph. 756, neque tu illi neque mihi viro ipsi credis? Pers. 131.

d) For *non* with the 2d person present indicative with imperative force, see p. 25.

5. Questions with *iam* and *etiam*.

a) *iam* (50).

1) First person: Men. 176, iam fores ferio? Eun. 814, iam dimitto exercitum? Both these are deliberative.

2) Second person (29), e.g. Amph. 798, iam tu quoque huius adiuvas insaniam? Asin. 338, iam devorandum censes, si conspexeris? Epid. 25; 401; Most. 836; Eun. 703, iam satis credis sobriam esse me? Ad. 290; Amph. 962, iam vos rediistis in concordiam? H. T. 350, iam hoc quoque negabis tibi placere? Trin. 912; Truc. 378.

3) Third person (19), e.g. Pers. 25, iam servi hic amant? 485, iam liberast? Eun. 704, iam satis certumst virginem vitiatam esse? Ad. 388; Amph. 957, iam pax est inter vos duos?

Iam in these questions at times seems merely a reënforcing particle, e.g. in Pers. 25; Amph. 798; H. T. 350 (all cited in full above), and elsewhere.

b) *etiam*, occasionally with the force of 'still,' 'yet,' 'again,' but more commonly used as a reënforcing particle.

1) *etiam*, 'still,' 'yet,' 'again' (22), e.g. Merc. 130, at etiam asto? Stich. 574, etiam valet? Asin. 677, furcifer, etiam me deluisti? Afran. 421, etiam quicquam egisti?

2) Reënforcing or intensifying *etiam*.

With imperative force (see p. 25) (19), e.g. *Curc.* 41, *etiam taces?* (= *tace!*); so also *Pers.* 152; *Ad.* 550; *Pers.* 278, *etiam dicis ubi sit?* *Bacch.* 670, *etiam quid respondetis mihi?* *H. T.* 235, *etiam caves?*

In purely exclamatory expressions (27), e.g. *Bacch.* 331, *etiam rogas?* so *Merc.* 202; *And.* 762; *Aul.* 424, *etiam rogitas?* *Bacch.* 785, *etiam minitare?* *Pers.* 290, *etiam male loquere?* *Capt.* 563, *etiam male loqui audes?* *Merc.* 763, *etiam negas?* 981, *etiam loquere?* *Bacch.* 910; *Amph.* 381; *Most.* 1132; *Men.* 499; *Liv. And. Trag.* 19, *etiam minitas?* *Turp.* 25, *etiam me inrides?* In *Merc.* 896, *etiam metuis?* and 981, *etiam loquere*, *etiam* may have the force of 'still'; so also in some other cases of this form, but this interpretation is never necessary. All of these examples under 2) are in the 2d person. An instance of the 3d person is found in *Rud.* 711, *at etiam minitatur?*

6. Continued and Supplementary Questions.

Morris (p. 77 ff.) distinguishes under this head the following categories:

a) Continued Questions (about 40). "To a previous question the speaker himself adds a second thought, either in a phrase or clause, in order to define the main question more precisely," e.g. *Pseud.* 616 ff. *esne tu an non es ab illo milite Macedonio? servos eius qui est mercatus . . . dederat . . . debet?* *Phor.* 739, *quis hic loquitur? :: Sophrona. :: et meum nomen nominat?* *Aul.* 772, *dic bona fide: tu id aurum non subrupuisti? :: bona. :: neque scis quis id abstulerit?* *Poen.* 879; *Pseud.* 484; *H. T.* 894; 973; *Stich.* 342.

b) Supplementary Questions (about 20). "Semi-interrogative phrases or clauses which supplement a remark made by another speaker," e.g. *Hec.* 809, *dic me orare ut veniat. :: ad te?* *H. T.* 778, *argentum dabitur ei ad nuptias, aurum atque vestem qui — tenesne? :: comparet?* *Amph.* 805, *ego accubui simul. :: in eodem lecto?* *H. T.* 905; *Ad.* 536; *Phor.* 209, *quin abeo? :: et quidem ego?* *Rud.* 1161, *ubi loci sunt spes meae? :: immo edepol meae?* Also questions with *si*, *sin*, *verum si*, *at si*, *etsi*, e.g. *Phor.* 492, *nondum mihi credis? :: hariolare. :: sin fidem do?* *And.* 348.

7. Other Questions without an Introductory Particle. These fall

into two classes according as the verb stands near the beginning or near the end.

a) Questions having the verb near the beginning (98).

1) Indicative present, 1st person (6), e.g. And. 423, *sum verus?* Enn. Trag. 335, *tueor te senex?* Most. 774, *eon?* *voco huc hominem?* with deliberative force; so also Poen. 1224, *pergo* (*perge, codd*) *etiam temptare?* M. G. 613, *gerimus rem?*

2) Indicative present, 2d person (36), e.g. Amph. 561, *audes mihi praedicare id?* Pers. 214, *sed quid tu?* *confitere, ut te autumo?* Eun. 705, *credis huic quod dicat?* Pers. 733, *redis tu tandem?* 379, *seis nam tibi quae praecepi?* Acc. 430, *reicis abs te religionem?* 433, *creditis me amici morte inlaturum manus?* Lucil. 394, *aurum vis?* 546; Trag. Incert. 34, *itis, paratis arma quam primum, viri?* with imperative force.

3) Indicative present 3d person (22), e.g. Men. 923, *solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri?* Poen. 755, *valent apud te quos volo?* Rud. 803, *licet saltem istas appellare?* Phor. 352, *negat Phanium esse hanc sibi cognatam Demipho?* *hanc Demipho negat esse cognatam?* Ad. 924, *iubet frater?* Aul. 357, *sunt asseres?* Men. 1107; Pacuv. 277, *parum est quod te aetas male habet?* Liv. And. Trag. 15, *mirum videtur?*

4) Indicative imperfect: Phor. 902, *verebamini ne id non facerem?* Ad. 693.

5) Indicative future: Truc. 205, *ibo igitur intro?* Hec. 672; Curc. 73, *quid! te antepones Veneri iaientaculo?* Ad. 193; Afran. 232, *contemnes?* Lucil. 279.

6) Indicative perfect (14), e.g. M. G. 829, *prompsisti tu vinum?* Poen. 723, *vidistis leno quom aurum accepit?* Rud. 378, *cavistis ergo tu atque erus ne abiret?* H. T. 978; Rud. 982, *ausu's comparare vidulum cum piscibus?*

7) Indicative pluperfect, Eun. 429, *audieras?*

8) Subjunctive. These are chiefly deliberative (11); see p. 181. Examples: Asin. 878, *possis, si forte conspexeris, cognoscere?* is potential. The imperfect subjunctive occurs Ad. 395.

A comparison of the foregoing material shows that about a third of the questions under this head are exclamatory. The remainder are questions asking for information.

b) Questions having the verb at or near the end (221).

1) Indicative present, 1st person (10), e.g. And. 906, Andrium ego Critonem video? H. T. 579, haec ego praecipio tibi? Phor. 812, hanc igitur mittimus? (deliberative); And. 921; Titin. 161, mirior tibi videor? Amph. 391.

2) Indicative present, 2d person (77), e.g. Merc. 160, dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites? Asin. 398, tu id nunc refers? Men. 1155, ergo nunc iam vis conclamari auctionem fore? Pers. 681, quod te dignumst, me dignum esse vis? Most. 262; Pseud. 826, quid tu? divinis condimentis utere? Ad. 596, id quia non est a me factum, agis gratias? Phor. 985, sic agitis? And. 545, alium esse censes nunc me atque olim? H. T. 729, atque tu hanc iocari credis? And. 321, hodie uxorem ducis? Crassus (Meyer), p. 270 tu lucem aspicere audes? Pacuv. 210, mecum altercas? Trag. Incert. 84, naufragia, labes generis ignoras? Afran. 149; Lucil. 193.

3) Indicative present, 3d person (42), e.g. Bacch. 854, scelestus tibi videtur Chrysalus? Cure. 572, leno minitatur mihi meaeque pugnae optritae iacent? Ad. 244, omnes dentes labefecit? etiam insuper defraudat? Amph. 774, salvom signumst? H. T. 607; Lucil. 908a, lena lenam deserit? Stat. 96; Enn. Trag. 137, nos quiescere aequom est? 193, Menelaus me obiurgat? Acc. 18, regnum tibi permitti malunt?

4) Indicative imperfect (6), e.g. Men. 1122, dic mihi! uno nomine ambo eratis? Phor. 858, tu quoque aderas? Pers. 686; Ad. 465, nostrum amicum noras?

5) Indicative future (24), e.g. M. G. 1021, quid ego? hic astabo! Rud. 657; Capt. 892, dubium habebis? Poen. 729, si pultem, non recludet? Eun. 690, eo rediges me, ut nesciam? Hee. 232; Acc. 624, pro certo arbitrabor sortis oracula? 51, hospitem depositam interemes? Afran. 147, de vita ac morte domini fabulabere? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 25, 1, Rhodiensibus id oberit? 24, 2, id nos priores facere occupabimus? 23, 17.

6) Indicative perfect (26), e.g. Asin. 410, hodie salvere iussi Libanum libertum? Eun. 420, quid? illud numquam tibi dixi? M. G. 1219, opsecro, tute ipsum convenisti? Eun. 241, simul consilium cum re amisti? Pacuv. 327, segregare abs te ausu's aut sine illo

Salaminem ingredi, neque es veritus? Afran. 69, nudius tertius tute advenisti? 441; And. 241, quid? Chremes id mutavit?

7) Indicative pluperfect, only Liv. And. Trag. 25, servis praestolaras?

8) Subjunctive (35). The examples are all deliberative; see p. 181 ff.

About two thirds of the material falling under the above head consists of exclamatory questions.

E. Questions in the Infinitive.¹

These are better considered as exclamations. I have treated them under the Infinitive, p. 423 ff.

F. *An* and Disjunctive Questions.²

1. The question with *an* is at the beginning of a speech and refers back to what has been said by the previous speaker (88), e.g. Most. 454, paene confregi fores. :: eho, an tu tetigisti has aedis? Asin. 837, credam, si te hilarum videro. :: an tu me tristem putas? M. G. 419, si quidem east. :: an dubium id tibist eam esse hanc? Pseud. 309, te vivom vellem. :: eho, an iam mortuast? And. 500, mihi quisquam (sc. renuntiavit)? :: an tute intellexti hoc adsimulari? H. T. 80, mihi sic est usus. :: an quoiquamst usus homini, se ut cruciet? Eun. 382, flagitium facimus. :: an id flagitiumst? Ad. 128, sicine agis? :: an ego totiens de eadem re audiam? Amph. 745; Bacch. 120; Rud. 578; Eun. 604; H. T. 990; Phor. 1009; Ad. 672; Acc. 665, an haec iam obliti sunt Phryges? 85; Naev. Com. 11, eho, an vicimus? 125; Crassus (Meyer), p. 267, an tu me his pignoribus existimas posse terreri? With *non*: Bacch. 121, an deus ullus Suavisatio? :: an non putasti esse umquam? And. 765, quid, Pamphili? :: eho, an non est? M. G. 301; Poen. 490; And. 781; 807; Eun. 959; Hee. 100.

2. The question with *an*, though not at the beginning of the speech, refers back to the words of the other speaker and the intervening sentence is parenthetical (11), e.g. Poen. 1194, sicut nos praestitimus

¹ Morris, p. 90 ff.

² Morris, p. 92 ff.; Hinze, De *an* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos vi et usu, 1887.

pulchritudine. :: stulta es. an tu eo pulchra videre, opsecro, si . . . ? Hec. 671, ego alam ? :: quid dixti ? an non alemus ? Aul. 82 ; Eun. 857.

3. The question with *an* refers to something the speaker himself has said (43).

1) The preceding sentence is declarative (14), e.g. Amph. 1026, paene ecfregisti cardines. an foris censebas nobis publicitus praeberier ? And. 620, qui me ex tranquillissima re coniecisti in nuptias. an non dixi esse hoc futurum ? Asin. 528 ; Men. 962 ; Hec. 215.

2) A *quis*-question precedes the question with *an* (27), e.g. Amph. 661, quid ille revortitur ? an ille me temptat sciens ? Most. 7, quid tibi clamitatio ? an ruri censes te esse ? Eun. 907, quam ob rem ? an quia pudet ? Asin. 524 ; Most. 35 ; H. T. 543 ; Phor. 602 ; Hec. 356.

3) A question with *num* precedes : Poen. 1315, num tibi malae aut dentes pruriunt ? an malam rem quaeris ? Phor. 412.

anne is found Cist. 518, anne etiam quid vis consultura sis sciam ? Truc. 666, anne oportuit ? And. 851, anne est intus Pamphilus ?

The usual doctrine concerning questions of the foregoing types is that they arise by ellipsis of the first member of complete disjunctive questions, but Morris (p. 95) well points out the difficulties in the way of this view. "There is," he remarks, "hardly a single one of these questions which naturally and easily suggests a complete disjunctive question; there is in most cases something forced and artificial in the ellipsis; and in some cases, e.g. Pseud. 1161 ; 1172 ; M. G. 822 ; 840, the awkwardness and artificiality are very clear . . . It is clear to me that it would be equally easy to supply a first member for all questions having *-ne* appended to the verb." It seems safest, therefore, to abandon the ellipsis theory, and regard *an* as originally a simple, not a disjunctive, particle.

In force these independent *an*-questions are largely exclamatory. Few of them ask for information. As a rule they express protest or surprise. It is this adversative force which has induced many scholars to accept Skutsch's etymology and derive *an* through *anne*¹ from **at-ne*. But it seems more natural to identify Latin *an* with

¹ Morris (p. 99) regards *an-ne* as a "further extension of *-ne* to sentences where it was not strictly necessary." Cf. *utrumne*, *numne*.

Greek *ἀν*; Gothic *an*. The latter particle also has adversative force; Brugmann, *Kurze Vgl. Gramm.* p. 615 (§ 831).

G. Complete Disjunctive Questions.

Complete disjunctive questions have the following forms:

1. *ne . . . an*, e.g. *Asin.* 504, *nequeone ego ted interdictis facere mansuetem meis? an ita tu es animata ut qui expers matris imperio sies?* *Men.* 319, *satin hoc quod vides obsonatum est, an opsono amplius?* *Merc.* 150, *vin tu te mihi opsequentem esse an nevis?* *M. G.* 1424, *verberon etiam, an mittis?* *Trin.* 332, *mercaturan, an venalis habuit?* *Phor.* 413; *Ad.* 336, *patiamurne an narremus quoipliam?* *Enn. Trag.* 68, *seditio tabetne, an numeros augificat suos?*

The foregoing examples are the only ones in which the two alternatives are expressed by verbs. In the following we have nouns, pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs: *Amph.* 343, *servosne es an liber?* *Asin.* 687, *amandone exorariet vis ted an osculando?* *Bacch.* 20, *Cupidon tecum saevit anne Amor?* *Capt.* 270; *Cas.* 405; *compressan palma an porrecta ferio?* *Epid.* 634, *satin ego oculis utilitatem optineo sincere an parum?* *Men.* 198, *sanus non es. :: egone an tu magis?* 1119; *Merc.* 128; 602; *M. G.* 784; 961; 965; 1020; *Pseud.* 610; *Trin.* 331; *H. T.* 203, *huncine erat aequom ex illius more an illum ex huius vivere?* *Phor.* 275; *Ad.* 185; *Trag. Incert.* 69, *ferron an fato moerus Argivom occidit?* *Naev. Trag.* 37, *egone an ille iniurie facimus?* 34; *Liv. And. Com.* 1, *pulicesne an cimices an pedes?* *Enn. Trag.* 232, *domum paternamne anne ad Peliae filias?* *-ne . . . an . . . an . . . an* occurs in *Eun.* 1045; and *Crassus* (Meyer), p. 270, *patrimonione augendo, an iuri civili, an rei militari an eloquentiae?*

2. *ne . . . an non*: *Aul.* 660, *abin hinc an non?* *Capt.* 74; 846, *iuben an non iubes astitui aulas?* *Cure.* 566; *Epid.* 538, *estne ea an non est ea quam animus retur meus?* *M. G.* 416; 449; *Pers.* 533; *Pseud.* 254, *licetne an non licet?* 616; 1246; *Rud.* 1399; *Trin.* 1071; *Truc.* 4, *daturin estis an non?* 755; 825; *And.* 186, *hocine agis an non?* 201, *hoc intellextin?* *an non dum etiam hoc quidem?* *H. T.* 405, *videon Clinian an non?* *Phor.* 852.

3. — . . . *an*: Bacch. 162, tibi ego an tu mihi servos es? 1167, etiam redditis nobis filios et servom? an exterior tecum vim maiorem? Capt. 334, sed is privatam servitutem servit an publicam? Cure. 589, maneam an abeam? Merc. 903, vidistis an de audito nuntias? Men. 915, album an atrum vinum potas? Rud. 853, rapi te mavis an trahi? Trin. 349, plus fit an minus? Liv. And. Od. 26; Atta, 18, pater vilicatur tuos an mater vilica est? Lucil. 803; Pacuv. 379.

4. — . . . *an non*: M. G. 787, lautam vis an quae non dum sit lauta? Pers. 378, futura es dicto oboediens an non patri? Stich. 263; Trin. 983; And. 762, tibi ego dico an non? Eun. 546; 968; H. T. 596; Phor. 147, pater eius rediit an non?

5. *an* . . . *an*: Amph. 690, an te auspiciū commoratum est an tempestas continet? Epid. 223, quid erat induta? an regillam induculam an mendiculam?

6. *utrum* . . . *-ne* . . . *an*. Only two alternatives are here expressed and *-ne* is apparently redundant: Bacch. 75, utrum ego istuc iocō adsimulem an serio? Rud. 104, sed utrum tu masne an femina es? Stich. 699, utrum Fontine an Libero imperium te inhibere mavis? Ad. 382, utrum studione id sibi habet an laudi putat fore? Eun. 721, utrum praedicemne an taceam?

7. *utrum* . . . *an*: Amph. 56, utrum sit an non voltis? Cas. 290, utrum tu caelibem te esse mavis liberum an maritum servom aetatem degere? Cist. 291, utrum deliras an astans somnias? 641; Pers. 341; Pseud. 878, utrum tu amicis an inimicis daturus cenam? Rud. 781; Trin. 175, utrum indicare me aequom fuit . . . an ego alium dominum paterer fieri?

8. *utrum* . . . *-ne* . . . *-ne*: Acc. 479, sed utrum terraene motus, sonitusne inferum pervasit auris?

9. — . . . *-ne*: Enn. Trag. 336, lumen iubarne in caelo cerno? Acc. 537, ubi habet? urbe agrone?

It seems plausible to see in the examples cited under 6 and 7 the earliest types of the disjunctive question. In sentences like Rud. 104, sed utrum tu masne an femina es? and Cist. 291, utrum deliras an astans somnias? *utrum* was originally the neuter of the interrogative adjective, — ‘which of the two is it?’ etc. Cf. Naev. Com. 54, utrum est melius: virginem an viduam uxorem ducere?

It was the context¹ and the slightly adversative force inherent in *an* that developed the meaning of 'or.' After the *utrum -ne . . . an* type of disjunctive question became established, *utrum* came to be felt to be superfluous; by its omission we get the *-ne . . . an* type, which for some reason became the favorite form in Early Latin. Similarly the *utrum . . . an* type often dispensed with *utrum*, thus giving us the — . . . *an* type, which is also fairly common in the Early period. But in the classical Latinity *utrum . . . an* asserts the supremacy.

¹ Wherever two questions come together, the ideas are, in the majority of cases, naturally alternative.

INDEX.

The numerals refer to pages.

A

- a*, with gerund, 452.
abdico, with inf., 383.
abeo, with inf. of purpose, 419.
abesse non potest quin, 247.
 Ablative Absolute, 433, 440.
abnuo, with inf., 399.
abnuto, with inf., 379.
absente nobis, 434.
 Absolute Use of verbs, 4.
absterreo, with *ne* and subjv., 240.
abstineo, with inf., 399; with *quin* and subjv., 247.
ac, 'as,' 'than,' 119; *ac si*, with subjv., 287.
acceptum est, with inf., 389; *acceptum habeo*, with inf., 388.
accidit, with inf., 390.
accipio, with inf., 372, 414.
accuro, with subjv., 229; with subjv. and *ut*, 229.
 Achronistic tense uses, pres. ind., 10; fut., 44; perf., 46; *quom*-clauses, 80; *ubi*-clauses, 88; *quando*-clauses, 90.
 Action ("Aktionsart"), 10.
 Active Voice, 4.
ad, in gerundive construction, 444; with gerund, 449.
ad quo, in indir. questions, 330.
adaeque ac, 119; *adaeque ut*, 109.
addecet, with inf., 396, 406.
adduco, with *ut* and subjv., 223; *adducor*, with inf., 388.
adfecto, with inf., 399.
adfirmit, with inf., 367.
adformido, with *ne* and subjv., 253.
adgredior, with inf., 400.
adhortor, with subjv., 220.
adigo, with subjv., 223.
 Adjective Uses of participles, 434, 440, 442; adjs. followed by the gerundive construction, 443, 445; with gerund, 449.
adiuro, with *ut* and subjv., 251; with inf., 367, 383; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
admiror, with inf., 377.
adnitor, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
adnuo, with inf., 367, 383; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
adorno, with inf., 400.
adparet, with inf., 390.
adpeto, with inf., 400.
adsimulo, with *quasi* and subjv., 286; with inf., 367, 383, 400; *adsimulo ut*, 109.
adspicio, with inf., 372.
adsuetus, with inf., 400.
 Adversative Clauses, in the ind., 13 ff.; with *etsi*, 139; with *tam etsi*, 139; with *etiam si*, 139; with *tamen etsi*, 140; with *tamen si*, 140; with *quamquam*, 140; corrective *quamquam*, 141; with *quom*, 141; rel. adv. clauses, 142; with *ut ut*, 142; in the subjv., 294; with *quom*, 303.
 Advising, verbs of, with subjv., 220 ff.
aegre est, with inf., 390.
aegrotus, with inf., 418.
aeque ac, 119; *aeque quam*, 116.
aequius est, with inf., 390; *aequius fuerat*, 52.
aequissimum est, with inf., 390.
aequom censeo, with inf., 388, 406; *aequom est*, with inf., 390, 396, 406, 415; with perf. inf. = pres., 427; *aequom videtur quin*, with subjv., 247; with *ut* and subjv., 239.
age, agite, agedum, with imv., 349, 357.
agito, with inf., 400.
ago, id ago, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with *ne* and subjv., 219; with *qui ne* and subjv., 230.
 Agreement of verb, with subj., 1.
aio, with inf., 367, 383, 414; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
aliquis, with plu. verb, 3; *aliquis qui*, with subjv., 291.
alius, with plu. verb, 3; *alius atque*, 119; *alius qui*, with subjv., 291; *aliud est*, with inf., 390.
alter, with plu. verb, 3.
amabo, 41; with imv., 349, 357; with subjv., 218; with *ut* and subjv., 218.

- amarum est*, with inf., 406.
amici est, with inf., 406.
amo, with *ut* and subjv., 218; with inf., 406.
an, in indir. questions in ind., 123; in subjv., 332; in sentence-questions, 485 ff.; . . . *an*, in indir. questions in subjv., 332; in sentence-questions, 487; *an* . . . *an*, in sentence-questions, 488; . . . *an* . . . *ne*, in indir. questions in the subjv., 333; . . . *an non*, in indir. questions in the subj., 333; in sentence-questions, 488.
animatus, with inf., 418; *animatus sum ut*, with subjv., 237.
animum aduerto, with inf., 372; *animum domo*, with *ut* and subjv., 223; *animum induco*, with *ut* and the subjv., 223; with *ne* and the subjv., 223; *animum induco*, in *animum induco*, with inf., 379, 385, 402; *animus*, 'resolve,' with *ut* and the subjv., 237; in *animo habeo*, with *ut ne* and the subjv., 237.
anne, in direct questions, 485; . . . *anne* in indir. questions in the subjv., 333.
. . . *annon* in questions with inv. force, 21 f.
ansa, with *ut* and the subjv., 235.
ante quam, with ind., 104, ftn.; with subjv., 324 ff.
Aoristic Action, 10 ff.; aoristic imperfect, 32; aoristic force of perf. subjv., 174, 182, 188, 189, 195, 202, 232, 251.
Apodoses, 60 ff.; independent subjv. with ind. protasis, 62 f.; 67, 69; 71 f.; ind. with subjv. protasis, 283; in inv., 63, 66, 69, 72, 75, 276; apodosis understood, 64, 67, 70, 277.
Aposiopesis, in cond. sentences, 67, 70, 76.
apparo, with obj. inf., 400; inf. of purpose, 418.
Appositives, inf. as appos., 397 f.; 412, 416; appos. uses of participles, 430, 436.
arbitror, with inf., 372, 383, 406, 414; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
argumentum, with *ne* and the subjv., 215.
arguo, with inf., 368; *arguor*, with inf., 388.
aspicio, with inf., 384.
Asseverations, in fut. ind., 44; with *ita* . . . *ut* and the ind., 111; with *sicut* . . . *ita*, 114; in the optative subjv., 194.
Assimilation, subjv. by, 305 ff.; after subjv., 307 ff.; after inf., 312 ff.
astutia, with *ut* and the subjv., 230.
atque, in apodosis after *postquam*, 101; after *quom*, 80; after *quoniam*, 93; after *ut*, 93; after *dum*, 96; 'as,' 'than,' 119; *atque uti*, 119; *atque ut ne*, connecting negative in purpose clauses, 263.
attendo, with inf., 400.
attinet, with inf., 406.
Attraction, of person, 4; of active verbs into the passive, 7; subjv. by attraction, 305 ff.; after subjv., 307 ff.; after inf., 312 ff.
Attributive Uses of participles, 430, 436.
auctor sum, with *ut* and the subjv., 221.
audacia, with inf., 399.
audeo, with *quin* and subjv., 247; with inf., 400.
audio, with inf., 372, 384, 414; with pres. inf. = fut., 426; *auditum est*, with inf., 390.
auguratum est, with inf., 390.
auris obtundo, with *ne* and subjv., 215.
ausculto, with inf., 372.
aut ne = *neve*, 243.
autumo, with inf., 368, 384, 414; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
- B
- Begging, verbs of, with subjv., 217 f.
bene est, with inf., 390.
bibere, in *da bibere*, 418.
bonum est, with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf., 407.
- C
- calleo*, with inf., 400.
canto, with *ut* and subjv., 221.
capital est, with inf., 407.
causa est ut, with subjv., 242; *nulla causa est quin*, with subjv., 246; *non causa est cur*, with subjv., 248; *numquid causae est quin*, with subjv., 246; *qua causa*, with subjv., 249; *causa*, with inf., 399.
Causal Clauses, in ind., 123 ff.; with *quod*, 123 ff.; substantive *quod*-clauses, 124 ff.; *quod*, 'as to the fact that,' 125; *quod*, 'in that,' 126; *nisi quod*, 126; *quia*-clauses, 126 ff.; *nisi quia*, 128, 131; substantive *quia*-clauses, 130; *quoniam*-clauses, 132; *quando*-clauses, 132; *quandoquidem*, 133; *quom*-clauses, 133; substantive *quom*-clauses, 135; *quatenus*, 136; *quid est quod*, 136; *hoc est quod*, 137; relative causal clauses, 137; *quippe qui*, 138; causal clauses in the subjv., with *qui* 292; with *quom*, 302; with *quod*, *quia*, *quo*, 318 f.
cautio, with *ne* and subjv., 233.

- cautior*, with *ne* and subjv., 233.
cave, with subjv., 232 ff.; with *ne* and subjv., 233.
caveo, with subjv., 232 f.; with *ut* and subjv., 234; with *ni* and subjv., 234; with inf., 400; with subjv., 232.
caveto, with *ne* and subjv., 233.
censeo, with subjv., 220 f.; with *ut* and subjv., 213, 221; with inf., 372, 384, 414; *aequom censeo*, with inf., 388, 406; *censeo*, with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
cerno, with inf., 372, 384, 400.
certa res est, with subjv., 236; with inf., 390, 407.
certatio est quin, with subjv., 247.
certo, with inf., 400.
certum est, with subjv., 236; with inf., 390, 396, 407; *certissimum est*, with inf., 390.
cesso, with inf., 400.
 Characteristic, Subjunctive of, 289.
clam me est, with inf., 390.
clamito, with *ut* and subjv., 214; with inf., 368, 384.
clamo, with inf., 384, 414.
 Clauses of Characteristic, 289.
coepi, with inf., 400.
coeptus sum = *coepi*, with pass. inf., 7.
cogito, with inf., 372, 400, 414.
cognitio, with inf., 373.
cognosco, with inf., 372, 384.
cogo, with *ut* and subjv., 223; with inf., 379.
 Commanding, verbs of, with subjv., 212 ff.
commemini, with inf., 373, 384, 400.
commemoro, with inf., 368.
commereo, with *ut* and subjv., 241.
comminiscor, with inf., 368, 384, 406.
committo, with *ut* and subjv., 235, 299.
commodius est, with inf., 407.
commodum est, with inf., 407.
commoneo, with *ut* and subjv., 221.
 Comparison, Clauses of, in ind., 106 ff.; *ut*-clauses, 106 ff.; *ita . . . ut* in asseverations, 111; *ut* causal, 112; *ut* = *quanto*, 113; *utquomque*, 113; in subjv. clauses of conditional comp., 285 ff.; with *quasi*, 285; *quamsi*, 287; *ut si*, 287; *tamquam*, 287; *tamquam si*, 287; *ac si*, 287; *ut quasi si*, 287.
comparo, with *ut* and subjv., 236; with inf., 400; with inf. of purpose, 418.
 Compelling, verbs of, with subjv., 220 ff.
comperco, with inf., 400.
comperio, with inf., 373, 384.
compesco, with inf., 400.
 Compliance, subjv. of, 176.
 Completed action, 10.
 Compound subject, agreement with, 1.
comprecor, with *ut* and subjv., 251.
comprimo with *quin* and subjv., 247.
 Conative Imperfect, 37; pres., 26.
concedo, with subjv., 235; with *ut* and subjv., 235.
 'Concessive' *si*-clauses, in ind., 78; in subjv., 282, 294.
concesso, with inf., 400.
concinno, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
concrimino, with inf., 384.
condecet, with inf., 390, 396, 407.
condicio, with *ut* and subjv., 267; with inf., 407.
condisco, with inf., 400.
 Conditional comparison, clauses of, 285 ff.
 Conditional Sentences, in ind., 60 ff.; protasis in pres. ind., 60 ff.; in imp. ind. 67; in fut. ind., 68 ff.; in perf. ind., 70; in plup. ind., 73; in fut. perf. ind., 73 ff.; two tenses combined in protasis, 76; dependent cond. sentences, 76 f.; substantive *si*-clauses, 77 f.; 'concessive' *si*-clauses, 78; cond. sentences in subjv., 271 ff.; protasis in pres. subj., 273 ff.; in perf., 277 ff.; in imp., 278 ff.; in plup., 280 ff.; 'concessive' *si*-clauses, 282; subjv. protasis with ind. apodosis, 283; dependent cond. sentences, 284.
conduci non possum, with *quin* and subjv., 247.
conducit, with inf., 390.
confero, with inf., 406.
confidentia, with inf., 373.
confido, with inf., 373, 384, 414.
confingo, with inf., 368.
confiteor, with inf., 368, 384.
 Congratulating, verbs of, with *quom* and ind., 134.
coniectura, with inf., 373.
coniuro, with subjv., 267; with *ut* and subjv., 267.
conlubet, with inf., 407.
conor, with inf., 400.
consciis, with inf., 373.
consentaneum, with inf., 391.
consentio, with inf., 373.
consequi, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
consilium, with *ut* and subjv., 237; *consilium do*, with *ut* and subjv., 221; *consilium est*, with inf., 407.
consimile est quasi and subjv., 286; *consimilis velut*, 115.
conspicio, with inf., 373.
conspicor, with inf., 373.
constat, with inf., 391.

- constituo*, with *ut* and subjv., 236; with inf., 379, 384, 400.
 Construction according to sense, 2.
consuefacio, with *ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 379.
consuesco, with inf., 400.
contendo, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
contineo, with *quin* and subjv., 246.
 Continued questions, 481.
convenit, with *ut* and subjv., 267; with inf., 391, 396, 407.
convicium est, with inf., 391.
convincio, with inf., 368.
copia, with *ut* and subjv., 235; *qui* and subjv., 236.
credibile est, with inf., 391.
credo, with inf., 373, 384, 414.
cruciat, with inf., 391; *crucior*, with inf., 377.
cuncto, with inf., 400.
cupido, with inf., 401.
cupidus, with gerundive const., 443; with gerund., 449.
cupio, with inf., 379, 384, 401; with perf. inf., = pres., 427; with perf. partic., 438.
cur, in indirect questions in ind., 122; in subjv., 330; with substantive clauses developed from the deliberative, 248.
cura, with *ut* and subjv., 230; with *ne* and subjv., 253; with *ut ne* and subjv., 230; with inf., 401.
curo, with subjv., 229; with *ut* and subjv., 229; with *ne* and subjv., 230; with inf., 377, 401; with gerundive, 444; *curatum est*, with inf., 391.
curro, with inf. of purpose, 418.
 Customary imperfect, 30.
- D
- da bibere*, 418; *da pignus ni*, with subjv., 265.
de, with gerundive const., 446.
debeo, with inf., 401.
deblatero, with inf., 368.
decerno, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with inf., 379, 401; *decretum est*, with inf., 391, 407; with subjv., 236.
decet, with subjv., 238; with inf., 391, 397, 407, 415; *decuit*, with perf. inf., = pres., 427.
 Deciding, verbs of, with subjv., 236 ff.
declaro, with inf., 368.
decorum est, with inf., 391.
dederam, as aoristic pluperfect, 50.
dedico, with inf., 368.
defendo, with *qui ne* and subjv., 240.
defessus, with inf., 418.
defetiscor, with inf., 401.
dehortor, with *ne* and subjv., 222; with inf., 379.
deiero, with inf., 368; 384.
delectat, with inf., 407.
delenio, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
 Deliberative clauses: delib. questions in pres. ind., 22 ff.; in fut. ind., 40; dependent delib. questions in ind., 123; delib. subjv., 178 ff.; subjv. of inquiry after a command, 179; of duty or fitness, 179; true deliberatives, 184; of impossibility or helplessness, 185; substantive clauses developed from the delib., 246 ff.
deliberatum est, with inf., 407.
delico, with inf., 368.
demiror, with inf., 377.
denego, with inf., 368, 384; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
depeciscor, with *ut* and subjv., 267.
depello, with *quin* and subjv., 247.
 Dependent clauses, in the ind., 60 ff.; in the subjv., 208 ff.; dependent conditional sentences in the ind., 76 ff.; in the subjv., 284.
deprecor, with *ne* and subjv., 219.
depropero, with inf., 401.
deputo, with inf., 373.
 Descriptive clauses, 288 ff.; potential descriptive clauses, 288; descriptive clauses of fact, 289; causal descriptive clauses, 292; adversative ('concessive') descriptive clauses, 294; jussive, deliberative, and optative descriptive clauses, 294.
 Deserving, verbs of, with subjv., 240 f.
desidero, with inf., 379.
desino, with inf., 401; *desitus est*, with pass. inf., 7, 416.
desisto, with inf., 401.
desuesco, with *ne* and subjv., 215.
 Determined Resolution, subjv. of, 161 f.
deterreo, with *ne* and subjv., 240; with *quin* and subjv., 246.
dico, with subjv., 212; with *ut* and subjv., 213, 251; with *ne* and subjv., 214; with *ut ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 368, 384, 414; with pres. inf., = fut. 426; *dicor*, with inf., 389; *dictum est*, with inf., 391.
dictito, with inf., 368.
difficile est, with inf., 391, 407.
difido, with inf., 385.
digno, with inf., 401.
dignus sum, with subjv., 260; with *ut* and subjv., 241; *dignum est*, with inf.,

- 391, 407; *dignum habeo*, *dignum arbitror*, with inf., 406.
diuidico, with inf., 374.
diligens, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
disciplina est, with inf., 407.
disco, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with inf., 401.
discrucior, with inf., 377.
Disjunctive questions, 486 ff.
disputet, with inf., 391, 407.
disputo, with inf., 414.
dissimulo, with *quasi* and subjv., 286; with inf., 368, 385.
dissuadeo, with *ne* and subjv., 222.
distaedet, with inf., 407.
dixeram, as aoristic plup., 50.
do, 'allow,' with subjv., 235; with *ut* and subjv., 235; *do operam*, with subjv., 230; with inf., 401; *do fidem*, with inf., 414; *do*, with inf. of purpose, 418; with perf. partic., 437; with gerundive, 444.
doceo, with *ut* and subjv., 213.
documentum do, with *ne* and subjv., 215.
doleo, with inf., 377.
dolus, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
donec, *donecum*, with pres., fut., perf., and fut. perf. ind., 100; with subjv., 304.
Double questions, 486 ff.; indirect double questions in subjv., 332 f.
dubito, with *quin* and subjv., 246; with inf., 401.
dubium est (*non dubium est*, *haud dubium est*), with *quin* and subjv., 246; *dubium est*, with inf., 391.
duco, with inf., 374, 385, 414.
dum, 'while,' with pres. ind., 95; with imp., fut., and perf. ind., 96; *dum* . . . *atque*, 96; *dum*, 'as long as,' with pres. imp., fut., and perf. ind., 97; *dum*, 'until,' with pres. and fut. ind., 98; with fut. perf. ind., 99; *dum* circumstantial, 99; *dum* in provisos, 268; *dum modo*, 269; *dum ne*, *dum ni*, 267; *dum*-clauses denoting a wish, 270; *-dum*, with inv., 350, 358.
duro, with inf., 401.
- E
- e*, with gerund, 452.
eapropter quod, with ind., 124.
ecquis, in indirect questions with subjv., 328; introducing sentence-questions, 475.
edico, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with *ne* and subjv., 214; with *neque* . . . *neque* and subjv., 215; with inf., 385.
edoceo, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with *ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 368.
efficio, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with *qui* and subjv., 229.
eminor, with *ne* and subjv., 215.
enitor, with inf., 401.
enumquam, introducing sentence-questions, 476.
enuntio, with inf., 369.
eo, with inf. of purpose, 419; *eo* with supine forming periphrastic expression, 454.
epistulam do, with *ut* and subjv., 219;
epistulam remitto, with inf., 369.
ergo, with gerundive const., 443.
est, with inf., 407; *est quod*, with subjv., 242.
et ne, as connecting neg. in volitive substantive clauses, 244; in purpose clauses, 263.
etiam, in questions with inv. force, 25; introducing sentence-questions, 480 ff.; *etiam si*, 139.
etsi, 139; *tam etsi*, 139.
evenit, with inf., 391.
ex, with gerundive const., 446.
exancto, with inf., 401.
Exclamations, in inf., 423; repudiating exclamations, 186 ff.
exclamo, with inf., 369.
excuso, with inf., 369.
exeo, with inf. of purpose, 419.
exinde ut, 109.
existumo, with inf., 374, 385, 414; *fas existumo*, 388; *existunor*, with inf., 389.
exiuro, with inf., 369.
exobsecro, with *ut* and subjv., 218.
exopto, with subjv., 250; with *ut* and subjv., 250; with inf., 379, 401.
exordior, with inf., 401.
exoro, with *ut* and subjv., 220; with *ne* and subjv., 220.
expedit, with inf., 392, 408.
experior, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with inf., 374, 385, 401.
expeto, with *ut* and subjv., 218, 251; with inf., 379, 385, 401; with perf. inf. = pres., 427.
exposco, with *ut* and subjv., 218.
expostulo, with inf., 369.
exprobro, with inf., 369.
expurigo, with inf., 369.
exsculpo, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
exsequor, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with inf., 401.
'Extensions' and original uses in subordinate clauses, 210 ff.
exterebro, with *ut* and subjv., 229.

F

fabrica, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
fac, with subjv., 224 ff.; with *ut* and subjv., 226; with *ne* and subjv., 228.
faciam, with subjv., 225.
facile est, with inf., 408.
facinus, 'duty,' with *ne* and subjv., 239;
facinus, 'act,' with inf., 399, 408, 413.
facio, with *ut* and subjv., 227; with *ne* and subjv., 228; with *ut ne* and subjv., 228; *facio quin*, with subjv., 247; with inf., 369; *nihili facio*, with inf., 406; with perf. partic., 438.
facite, with subjv., 224 ff.; with *ut* and subjv., 226 f.
facito, with subjv., 225 ff.; *facitote*, with subjv., 225 f.; *faciunto*, with subjv., 225 f.
facto, in *opus est facto*, *usus est facto*, with *ut* and subjv., 227.
factum, with inf., 399.
fallacia, with *ut* and subjv., 230; with inf., 399.
fallit, with *quin* and subjv., 247; with inf., 392.
falsus sum, with inf., 374.
fama, with inf., 385, 399; *famam trado*, with *ut* and subjv., 221.
fas est, with inf., 392, 408; *fas existumo*, with inf., 388.
fateor, with inf., 369, 385, 414.
fatiscor, with inf., 401.
faveo, with inf., 401.
faxim, with subjv., 226; with *ut* and subjv., 227.
fazo, with *ut* and subjv., 225 f.
Fearing, verbs of, with *quom*-clause, 134; with *ne* and *ut* with subjv., 252 ff.
fero graviter, with inf., 377; *feror*, with inf., 389.
ferox est, with inf., 377.
festino, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
fidem do, with inf., 369, 414.
fides, with inf., 374.
feri potest, with *ne*, *ut ne*, and subjv., 238.
Final clauses, 255 ff.
fingo, with inf., 385.
fit, with inf., 408.
flagitum est, with inf., 392, 408.
flagito, with *ut* and subjv., 213.
Forcing, verbs of, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
fornido, with *ne* and subjv., 253; with inf., 377, 402.
fortasse, with inf., 392, 397.
*fuera*m, as aoristic plup., 51.
fugito, with inf., 402.

fuisse, 'to be dead,' 428.
futtilum est, with inf., 408.
Future active participle, 435; in periphrastic conj., 457 f.
Future ind., 38 ff.; volitive uses, 38 ff.; resolves, 39; commands, 39; compliance, 39; deliberatives, 40; permissive, 41; threats, 41; promises, 41: declarations of intention, 42; pure fut. uses, 43; expectation, 43; predictions, 43; optative uses, 43 ff.; achronistic, 44; potential, 44; in protases, 68 ff.; pres. ind. with fut. force, 18 ff.; fut. from past standpoint, 35; fut. time in indirect questions, 334.
Future perfect ind., 53 ff.; as fut., 54 ff.; as true fut. perf., 58 f.; 'shifted' fut. perf., 59; as imv., 59; in protases, 73.

G

gaudeo, with inf., 378, 402, 414.
gaudio est, with inf., 392.
General truths, in pres. ind., 11.
Gerund, 446 ff.; gen., 446 ff.; dat., 449; acc., 449; abl., 450.
Gerundive, 441 ff.; as adj., 442; as partic., 442; gen., 442; dat., 443; acc., 443 ff.; abl., 445 ff.; with *de*, *ex*, *in*, *pro*, 446; in periphrastic conj., 458.
gestio, with inf., 379, 402.
glorior, with inf., 414.
gratiam facio, with *ne . . . neve* and subjv., 242; *gratiam habeo*, with inf., 378, 385.
gratias ago, with inf., 378.
gratulor, with inf., 378.
gratum est, with inf., 392.
grave est, with inf., 392.

H

habeo acceptum, with inf., 388; *habeo gratiam*, with inf., 385; *habeo dignum*, with inf., 406; *habeo necesse*, with inf., *habeo sat*, with inf., 406; *habeo sanctus*, with inf., 388; *habeo sic*, *habeo pro*, with inf., 374; *habeo*, with perf. partic., 439.
hariolor, with inf., 369.
haud dubium est, with *quin* and subjv., 246.
Hindering, verbs of, with subjv., 239 f.
Historical inf., 419.
Historical perf. ind., 46.
Historical pres., 11 ff.; with *quom*, 80 f.; with *ubi*, 86 f.; with *quoniam*, 93; with *dum*, 96; with *postquam*, 101.

hoc est quod, 'this is why,' 137.
hoc modo, hoc pacto, ut, 109.
hominis est, with inf., 408.
honestius est, with inf., 392, 408.
honestum est, with inf., 392.
 Hoping, verbs of, with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
hortor, with *ne* and subjv., 222.
 Hortatory subjv., 166.
hortor, with subjv., 221; with *ut* and subjv., 221.
humanum est, with inf., 392, 408.
 Hypotaxis, 208.

I

idcirco quod, 124.
idem ut, 109.
idoneus, with subjv., 260.
ille qui, with subjv., 291.
impello, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
 Imperative, 348 ff.; doubled forms, 348; with reinforcing expressions, *amabo, obsecro*, etc., 349; pres. inv., 348 ff.; pres. for fut., 350; logical force of pres. inv., 351 f.; pres. inv., as protasis, 353; with permissive force, 353; fut. inv., 354 ff.; following pres., 355; with adverbs referring to fut., 356; with reinforcing expressions, *amabo, obsecro*, etc., 357; logical force of fut. inv., 359; fut. inv. in laws, proverbs, rules for conduct, recipes, etc., 360; as protasis, 361; denoting a proviso, 361; with permissive force, 361; concessive, 361; negative uses of inv., 362 ff.; *noli, nolite* with inf., 363; *nolito*, with inf., 365; connecting negs., with inv., 364 ff. — Imperative force of questions in pres. ind., 24.
 Imperfect ind., 26 ff.; progressive, 26; customary, 30 ff.; aoristic, 32; fut. from past standpoint, 35; 'shifted,' 36; for pres., 36; with *iam diu*, etc., 37; of immediate past, 37; inceptive, 37; conative, 37; reminiscent, 38; in protases, 67.
impero, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with *ne* and subjv., 214; with inf., 379; 385.
 Impersonal verbs, 7.
impetro, with subjv., 219; with *ut* and subjv., 220; with *ne, ut ne*, and subjv., 220.
in, with abl. of gerund, 452; with abl. of gerundive const., 446.
 Inceptive imp. ind., 37.
incepto, with inf., 402.
incidit, with inf., 408.
incipio, with *ut* and subjv., 230; with inf., 402.

incipisso, with inf., 402.
incommodum est, with inf., 408.
indaudio, with inf., 374.
 Indefinite 2d sing. of subjv. in subordinate clauses, 319.
 Independent sentences in ind., 11 ff.; in subjv., 161 ff.
 Indicative in principal clauses, 11 ff.; in subordinate clause, 60 ff.; see under the various tenses.
indico, with *ut ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 369.
indignus, with *qui* and subjv., 260.
 Indirect discourse, subjv. in subordinate clauses in, 315 ff.; in implied indirect discourse, 318.
 Indirect questions, in ind., 120 ff.; in subjv., 326 ff.; list of words and expressions used in indirect questions, 335 ff.; indirect questions without introductory particles, 332.
 Inducing, verbs of, with subjv., 220 ff.
induco, animum induco, with *ut* and subjv., 223; *induco* with inf., 385; *inductum est* with inf., 416; *induco animum*, with inf., 379, 385, 402; *induco in animum*, with inf., 379, 402.
 Infinitive, origin, 366; with subj. acc., as object of *verba declarandi*, etc., 367 ff.; dependent on context, 383; as object with subj. understood, 383 ff.; *aequom censeo* type, 388; 'Nominativus cum infinitivo,' 388; inf. with subj. acc. as subject, 389 ff.; inf. as subj. with subj. acc. understood, 396; inf. with subj. acc. as appositive, 397 ff.; inf. with subj. acc. as pred., 399; inf. without subj. acc. as obj., 399; *aequom censeo* type, 406; inf. without subj. acc. as subj., 406 ff.; inf. without subj. acc. as appositive, 412; impersonal inf., 413 ff.; inf. to be supplied from context, 416; dependent on nouns, 417; on adjs., 418; inf. of purpose, 418; historical inf., 419; in exclamations, 423; in titles, 425; tenses of inf., 426 ff.; pres. for fut., 426 f.; with *memini*, 427; perf. with aoristic force, 427.
infit, with inf., 402.
iniquum est, with inf., 392.
iniurium est, with inf., 392, 408.
inmemor est, with inf., 402.
immortalis, with inf., 418.
inscitiast, with inf., 392, 408.
insimulo, with inf., 369.
insipientia est, with inf., 408.
insisto, with inf., 402.

inspecto, with inf., 374, 385.
instigo, with *ut nullus* and subjv., 222.
instituo, with inf., 402.
insto, with *ut* and subjv., 221; with *ne* and subjv., 222; with inf., 402, 414.
insuesco, with inf., 402.
intellego, with inf., 374, 385, 414.
intendo, with inf., 369, 402.
inter, with gerund, 450; with gerundive, 445.
interdico, with *ne* and subjv., 214; *nihil interdico ut* and subjv., 235.
interest, with inf., 392.
interminor, with *ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 369; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
intermitto, with *quin* and subjv., 247; *intermissus est*, with pass. inf., 7; *intermissum est*, with inf., 392, 408, 416.
interpello, with inf., 369.
 Intransitive verbs used transitively, 5.
invenio, with inf., 374, 414.
invideo, with inf., 378, 414.
invito, with *ut* and subjv., 218.
invoco, with *ut* and subjv., 218, 251.
ira incendor, with inf., 378.
is qui, with subjv., 291.
iste qui, with subjv., 291.
ita, *ut* . . . *ita*, 106 f., 108, 109, 110; in asseverations, 111; *ita* . . . *quam*, 116; *ita est*, with inf., 392.
item, *ut* . . . *item*, 106 f., 108, 109, 110.
 Iterative action, 10; in subordinate clauses, with *quom*, 82; *ubi*, 87, 88, 89; *quando*, 92, 93; iterative subjv., 338.
itero, with inf., 369, 383, 389.
itidem, *ut* . . . *itidem*, 106 f., 108, 109, 110.

J

iam, introducing sentence-questions, 480 ff.; *iam*, *iam dudum*, *iam diu*, *iam pridem*, with present ind., 17 f.; with imp., 37.
iubeo, with subjv., 213; with *ut* and subjv., 213; with inf., 380, 386, 414; *iubeor*, with inf., 389.
iudico, with *ne* and subjv., 237; with inf., 374, 415.
iuro, with inf., 369, 386; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
ius est, with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf., 392; *ius iurandum*, with inf., 369, 386.
iusseram, as aoristic plup., 50.
 Jussive subjunctive, 162 ff.; as protasis, 178; with reinforcing particles, 164 f.; perfect jussive, 166; jussive develop-

ments, 174 f.; dependent jussives, 212 ff.; jussive descriptive clauses, 295.
justum est, with subjv., 239.

L

laboro, with inf., 402.
laetor, with inf., 378.
laetus sum, with inf., 378, 386.
laudo, with inf., 370.
lepidum est, with inf., 408.
lex, with *ut* and subjv., 214, 267.
licet, with subjv., 234 f.; with inf., 392, 409, 416.
liquet, with inf., 409.
litteras do, with *ut* and subjv., 219.
 Local particles, with ind., 142 ff.
loco, with gerundive, 444.
longum est, with inf., 392.
lubet, with inf., 392, 409.
lubido, with inf., 402.
lucrum est, with inf., 409.

M

machina, with *qui* and subjv., 230.
maereo, with inf., 378.
maestus sum, with inf., 378.
malim, as potential, 198 f.; with subjv., 250; with *ut* and subjv., 250.
malo, with subjv., 250; with inf., 380, 386, 402, 415.
malum, with inf., 409.
mando, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with *ne* and subjv., 214.
manus, *in manu est*, with *ne*, *ut ne* and subjv., 240; with *quin* and subjv., 247.
matronae est, with inf., 409.
mavellem, with subjv., 250.
meditor, with inf., 402.
melius est, with subjv., 238; with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf., 393, 397, 409, 416.
meliusculum est, with inf., 409.
memento, with *ut* and subjv., 242.
memini, with inf., 374, 386, 402, 427.
memoria, *in memoriam regredior*, *in memoria habeo*, with inf., 375.
memoro, with inf., 370.
mentem, *in mentem est*, with subjv., 251; with inf., 393, 409; *in mentem venit*, with inf., 393.
mentionem facio, with *ut* and subjv., 218; with *ut ne* and subjv., 219; with inf., 370.
mereo, *mereor*, with *ut* and subjv., 241; *mereo quam ob rem*, 248.
meticulosa res est, with inf., 409.

- metuo*, with *ne* and subjv., 252 f.; with *ut*, 254; with *ne non*, 254; with *ni*, 254; with *quin*, 247; with inf., 403.
metus, with *ne* and subjv., 253; with inf., 403.
meum est, with inf., 409.
minime, as negative of prohibitive subjv., 171.
minitor, with inf., 370, 403.
minor, with inf., 370, 386; with pres. inf., = fut., 426.
mirabile est, with inf., 393.
mirandum est, with inf., 397.
miror, with inf., 378, 386.
mirum est, *miru videntur*, with inf., 393, 397, 409; *mirum ni, mira sunt ni, mirum si*, with ind., 64, 70, 72.
miseret, with inf., 393.
miseria est, with inf., 393, 409, 416.
miserum est, with inf., 393.
mitto, 'permit,' with *ut* and subjv., 235; with inf., 403; with inf. of purpose, 419.
modo, with pres. ind., 18; as reinforcing particle, with jussives, 165; with clauses of proviso, 269; with inv., 350, 358; *modo ut*, with jussives, 165.
modus, with inf., 417.
molestiae est, with inf., 393.
molestum est, with inf., 409.
Momentary action, 10.
moneo, with subjv., 220; with *ut* and subjv., 221; *moneo ne*, with subjv., 222; with inf., 380.
monstro, with *ut* and subjv., 214; with *ne* and subjv., 215; *monstror*, with inf., 389.
mora, with *quin* and subj., 247; with inf., 409.
moror, with *quin* and subjv., 247, with inf., 378.
mos est, with inf., 393, 409.
multa, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
multi qui, with subjv., 291.

N

narro, with inf., 370.
navorum est, with inf., 409.
-ne, in questions with inv. force, 25; in repudiating questions, 188, 191; *-ne ut* in repudiating questions, 190, 191; *-ne* in inf. of exclamation, 424; in sentence-questions, 460 ff.; appended to verbs, 460 ff.; to pronouns, 466 ff.; to nouns, 468; to adjs. and participles, 469; to adverbs, 469; to relatives, 472; to conjunctions, 473; to interrogatives, 473; *-ne* in in-
direct questions, in ind., 122; in subjv., 332; *-ne . . . an*, in sentence = questions, 486; in indirect questions in subjv., 333; *-ne . . . aune*, in indirect questions in subjv., 333; — . . . *-ne* in sentence-questions, 487; in indirect questions in subjv., 333; *-ne . . . necne* in indirect questions in subjv., 333; *-ne . . . an non*, in sentence-questions, 486; in questions in pres. ind. with inv. force, 21 f.; in indirect questions in subjv., 333; *-ne . . . -ne* in indirect questions in subjv., 333.
ne, in purpose clauses, 257; *ne*, 'on condition that,' 265; *ne*, 'without,' 266.
nec, neque, connecting hortatory subjvs., 167; with prohibitives, 170, 171; with permissives, 175; *neque . . . neque*, 177; *nec* with optatives, 195, 196; in substantive clauses developed from volitive and optative, 243, 254 f., 265; *ut neque . . . neque*, 230; *neque* with inv., 365.
nec quisquam quin, with subjv., 247.
necessarium est, with inf., 410.
necesse est, with subjv., 239; with *ut* and subjv., 239; *necesse, necessum, necessus*, with inf., 393, 397, 410; *necesse habeo*, with inf., 406.
— . . . *necne*, in indirect questions, 333.
nefas est, with inf., 393.
Negatives, with subjv., 170, 171, 195 ff., 243; connecting negs., 244, 263.
neglego, with inf., 403.
nego, with inf., 370, 386, 403; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
negotium do, with *ut* and subjv., 214; *negotium quin*, with subjv., 247.
nemo, with prohibitive subjv., 170, 171; *nemo qui, nemo quin*, with subjv., 290.
neque est cur, with subjv., 248.
nequeo, with *quin* and subjv., 247; with inf., 403; *nequitur*, with pass. inf., 7.
nescio, with inf., 375, 403.
nescivi = *nescio*, 46.
neu, neve, as connecting neg., with prohibitive, 170, 171; *neu . . . neu*, 177; *neu* with optatives, 197; with substantive clauses developed from volitive and optative, 243, 253 ff., 265; in purpose clauses, 263; with inv., 364 f.
neuter, with plu. verb, 2.
ni, 'unless,' with ind., 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 73, 74, 75; with subjv., 273, 274, 275, 276, 279, 281; with inv., 364.
ni = *ne*, with prohibitive subjv., 169; with deliberatives, 182, 183, 184; in substantive clauses developed from volitive and optative, 219, 234, 254, 265, 269.

- nihil est*, with inf., 393, 410; *nihil est quod*, with subjv., 241; *nihili facio*, with inf., 406; *nihil quod*, with subjv., 290.
- nil*, as neg. of prohibitive, 171.
- nil moror*, with inf., 403.
- nil quin* and subj., 290.
- nil scio quod*, with subjv., 242.
- nimium est*, with inf., 393.
- nisi*, with ind. and subjv., in conditional sentences, see examples under Conditional Sentences, 60 ff., 273 ff.; = *nisi quia*, 131 ad fin.; *nisi forte*, 61; *nisi quia*, 128, 131; *nisi quod*, 126; *nisi si*, with ind., 61, 64, 65, 71, 73; with subjv., 273; *nisi ut*, with subjv., 242.
- nitor*, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
- nive*, with ind., in conditional sentences, 63; with prohibitives, 170; with inv., 364.
- nobile est*, with inf., 393.
- nolim*, potential, 198 f.
- nolito*, w. inv., 365.
- noli*, *nolite*, with inf., 363.
- nolo*, with subjv., 215 f., 250; with *ut* and subjv., 250; with inf., 380, 386, 403, 415; with perf. inf. = pres., 428; with perf. partic., 438 ad fin.
- nolueram*, as aoristic plup., 51.
- non*, in questions with inv. force, 25; as neg. of hortatory subjv., 167; with prohibitive, 170; with optative, 195; with negative questions of duty or fitness, 183; in sentence-questions, 478 ff.; *non dubium est quin* and subjv., 246; *non est cur* and subjv., 248; *non est quod* and subjv., 241; *non quicquam quod* and subjv., 290; *non quisquam qui* and subjv., 290; *non ullus qui* and subjv., 290.
- nonne*, with deliberatives, 183; in sentence-questions, 472.
- nosco*, *novi* with inf., 375, 403.
- nostrum est*, with inf., 410.
- nullus*, as negative of prohibitive subjv., 171; *nullus qui*, *nullus quin*, and subjv., 290.
- num*, *numquam*, *numquis*, *numquid*, introducing sentence-questions, 473 f.; *num* in indirect questions in ind., 122; in subjv., 332; *numquis* in indirect questions in subjv., 328; *numquid vis*, with subjv., 216.
- Number, of verb, 1.
- numquam*, as neg. with optative, 195.
- nuntio*, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with inf., 370, 386; *nuntiatum est*, with inf., 393.
- nuntius*, with inf., 370, 386.
- nuto*, with *ne* and subjv., 215.
- O
- ob*, in gerundive construction, 445; with gerund, 450.
- obicio*, with inf., 370.
- obiecto*, with inf., 370, 386.
- Obligation, subjunctive of unfulfilled, 176.
- obliviscor*, with inf., 375, 403.
- obsecro*, with subjv., 218; with *ut* and subjv., 218; with *ne*, *ut ne*, and subjv., 219; with inv., 349, 357.
- obstat*, with *cur* and subjv., 248.
- obtestor*, with *ut* and subjv., 218, 251; with *ne* and subjv., 219.
- occasio*, with *ut* and subjv., 235; with inf., 417.
- occepto*, with inf., 403.
- occipio*, with inf., 403; *occeptus sum*, with pass. inf., 7.
- occulto*, with inf., 403.
- occupatus*, with inf., 418.
- occupo*, with inf., 403.
- occurro*, with *ne* and subjv., 240.
- odi*, with inf., 378, 404.
- odio est*, with inf., 410.
- odiosum est*, with inf., 410.
- officium est*, with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf., 393, 410.
- Omission of verb, 9.
- omitto*, with inf., 404.
- onus est*, with inf., 410.
- opera*, with inf., 417; *operam do*, *addo*, with *ut* and subjv., 230; *operam do*, with inf., 401; *operae pretium est*, with inf., 393, 410; with perf. inf. = pres., 428.
- opinio*, with inf., 375.
- opinor*, with inf., 375, 386, 415.
- oportet*, with subjv., 238; with inf., 393, 397, 410, 416; *oportuit*, with perf. inf. = pres., 428.
- Optative, I.-E. opt. in Latin subjv., 146; original force of opt., 153 ff.; opt. uses of subjv., 191; of fut. ind., 43 f.; as-severative opt., 194, 196; connecting negs. with opt., 195 ff.; opt. substantive clauses, 249; after verbs of wishing, 249 ff.; in descriptive clauses, 295.
- optineo*, with inf., 404.
- opto*, with *ut* and subjv., 250; with inf., 380, 386, 404.
- optimum est*, with subjv., 238; with *ut* and subjv., 238; with inf., 397, 410, 416.
- opus*, 'work,' with inf., 413; *opus est*, 'it is necessary,' with subjv., 239; with *ut* and subjv., 239; *opus est facto*, with *ut* and subjv., 227; *opus est*, with inf.,

- 394, 397, 410; with perf. inf. = pres., 428; with supine, 457.
- Oratio obliqua, subjv. in, 315 ff.; in principal clauses, 318.
- Ordering, verbs of, with subjv., 212 ff.
- ordior*, with inf., 404.
- oro*, with subjv., 217; with *ut* and subjv., 218, 251; with *ne*, and *ut ne*, subjv., 219; with inv., 349.
- ostendo*, with inf., 370.
- osus sum*, with deponent inf., 7.
- P
- pacisco*, with subjv., 267; with subjv. and *ut*, 267.
- pacto*, with *ut* and subjv., 267.
- paenitet*, with *ne* and subjv., 267.
- par est*, with inf., 394, 410; *par videtur*, with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf., 394.
- Parataxis, 60, 208.
- paratus*, with inf., 418.
- parco*, with inf., 404; with *ne . . . neu . . . neu*, 242.
- pariter ac*, 119; *pariter ut*, 107, 109.
- parito*, with inf., 404.
- paro*, with *ut* and subjv., 236; with *ne* and subjv., 237; with inf., 404.
- pars*, with plu. verb, 3.
- Participles, pres. partic., 428 f.; attributive uses, 430; appositive uses, 430; predicate uses, 433; adj. uses, 434; substantive uses, 434; time of the pres. partic., 435; fut. act. partic., 435; perf. partic., 435; of deponents, 435 f.; attributive use, 436; appositive uses, 436; predicate uses, 437; abl. abs., 440; adj. uses, 440; substantive uses, 440; the gerundive, 441 ff.; as adj., 442; in nom., 442; gen., 442; dat., 443; acc., 443 ff.; abl., 445 f.
- partim*, with plu. verb, 3.
- Passive voice, by attraction, 7; as reflexive, 6.
- patior*, with *ut* and subjv., 235; with inf., 378, 386, 415.
- patris est*, with inf., 394, 410.
- pauci quī*, with subjv., 291.
- paveo*, with *ne* and subjv., 253; with *ut* and subjv., 254.
- pendo nilī*, with inf., 378.
- percipio*, with inf., 375, 386.
- percupio*, with inf., 404.
- perdisco*, with inf., 375.
- perdo*, with inf., 406.
- perdoceo*, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with inf., 380.
- perdoliscit*, with inf., 394.
- perduco*, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
- Perfect ind., 45 ff.; pres. perf., 45; hist. perf., 46; as fut., 46; as fut. perf., 46; equivalent to plup. subjv., 46; in protasis, 70.
- Perfect inf., with aoristic force, 427.
- Perfect passive partic., 435.
- Perfect subjv., force of tenses in, 173, 242, 255.
- perfero*, with inf., 378.
- perficio*, with *ut* and subjv., 228.
- pergo*, with inf., 404.
- perhibeo*, with inf., 370; *perhibeor*, with inf., 389.
- periculum*, with *ne* and subjv., 253; *periculum est*, with inf., 394, 410; *periculi est*, with inf., 411.
- perinde . . . ut*, 109.
- Periphrastic conjugations, 457; fut. act. partic. and *sum*, 457; gerundive and *sum*, 458; pres. act. partic. and *sum*, 458 f.
- peritus*, with gerund, 449.
- perlubet*, with inf., 411.
- Permissive subjv., 174.
- Permitting, verbs of, with subjv., 234 f.
- pernego*, with inf., 370.
- peropus est*, with inf., 394.
- perpello*, with *ut* and subjv., 223.
- perpetior*, with inf., 378.
- perpetro*, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with inf., 404.
- perrepto*, with inf. of purpose, 419.
- persentisco*, with inf., 375.
- persequor*, with inf., 404.
- persevero*, with inf., 404.
- Person, agreement of, 3; attraction of, 4.
- persuadeo*, with subjv., 223; with *ut* and subjv., 223; with *neve* and subjv., 223; *persuasum est*, with inf., 411.
- Persuading, verbs of, with subjv., 222.
- pervolo*, with inf., 380, 404.
- peto*, with *ut* and subjv., 218; with inf., 380; with gerundive, 444.
- piaculum est*, with inf., 394, 411.
- piget*, with inf., 411, 416.
- pigro*, with inf., 404.
- placabilius est*, with inf., 395.
- placet*, with inf., 395.
- placitum est*, with subjv., 236.
- ploro*, with inf., 404.
- Pluperfect ind., 47 ff.; denoting a prior past act, 48 ff.; as simple past, 50 ff.; *satiū fuerat*, *aequius fuerat*, *par fuerat*, 52; denoting state of completed act, 53; in protasis, 73.

- Pluperfect subjv., optative uses, 197; potentials, 205; in conditional sentences, 280.
- Plural verb, with compound subj., 1; with subjects connected by disjunctive particles, 2.
- polliceor*, with inf., 370, 386; with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
- pono*, with inf., 370.
- porceo*, with inf., 381.
- portendo*, with inf., 371.
- possum*, *non possum quin* and subjv., 247; *possum* with inf., 404; with perf. inf. = pres., 428.
- postquam*, 101 ff.; *postquam*, 'after,' with hist. pres., imp., and perf., 101; with plup., 102; with fut. perf., 102; *postquam*, 'now that,' 102; *postquam*, 'since,' 103; *postquam* causal, 103; *postquam* . . . *post*, 101.
- postulo*, with subjv., 213; with *ut* and subjv., 213, 218; with *ne* and subjv., 215; *non postulo quin*, with subjv., 247; with inf., 381, 387, 404.
- 'Potential' fut., 44.
- Potential subjv., 197 ff.; as apodosis, 200 ff.; 'may' potentials, 205 f.; 'can'-'could' potentials, 206; potential descriptive clauses, 288.
- potest ut ne*, *feri potest ne*, *ut ne*, with subjv., 238; *potest*, with inf., 416; *potes-tur*, with pass. inf., 7.
- potestas*, with *ut* and subjv., 235.
- potin*, *potin ut*, *potin ne*, *potin ut ne*, with subjv., 237; *potin* in sentence-questions, 471 f.
- potis est*, with *ut* and subjv., 237.
- potius quam*, with subjv., 322 ff.
- praecipio*, with *ut* and subjv., 213; with *ne* and subjv., 215.
- praedico*, with inf., 371.
- praedico*, with subjv., 213; with *ut* and subjv., 214; with *ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 371, 387.
- prae festino*, with inf., 405.
- praemonstro*, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
- praepeto*, with *ut* and subjv., 251; with inf., 381, 405.
- praesagio*, with inf., 371.
- praesente his*, 434.
- praesentio*, with inf., 375.
- praesertim quom*, 135.
- praestabilis est*, with inf., 395, 411.
- praestat*, with inf., 395, 411.
- praetereo*, with inf., 405.
- praetut*, 115.
- Praising, verbs of, with *quom*-clause, 134.
- pravitas*, with inf., 395.
- precor*, with *ut* and subjv., 251.
- Predicate use of inf. with subjv. acc., 399, 413; predicate use of participles, 433, 437, 442.
- Present ind., 11 ff.; in general truths, 11; hist. pres., 11 ff.; with *iam*, *iam diu*, etc., 17 ff.; as fut., 18 ff.; in deliberative questions, 22 ff.; in questions with inv. force, 24 ff.; conative pres., 26; in pro-tasis, 60 ff.; with fut. force, 65 ff.
- Present inf., with fut. force, 426 f.
- Present participle, 428 f.; in periphrastic conjugation, 458 f.
- Present perf. ind., 45 f.
- Present subjv., in conditional sentences contrary to fact, 273.
- Preventing, verbs of, with subjv., 239.
- Principal clauses, in ind., 10 ff.; in subjv., 161 ff.
- principium est*, with inf., 411.
- prius quam*, with pres. and imp. ind., 104; with fut., perf., plup., and fut. perf. ind., 105; with subjv., 324 ff.
- pro*, with gerund, 452; in gerundive const., 446.
- probrum est*, with inf., 411.
- proco*, with inf., 371.
- prodest*, with inf., 395.
- proficiscor*, with inf. of purpose, 419.
- profiteor*, with inf., 371.
- progredior*, with inf. of purpose, 419.
- Progressive action, 10; progressive imp., 26 ff.
- prohibeo*, with subjv., 240; with *ne* and subjv., 240; with *quin* and subjv., 246; with inf., 381, 387.
- Prohibitive subjunctive, 168; connecting negatives with, 170, 171; force of tenses, 173.
- proin*, *proinde*, with inv., 350, 358; *proinde ac*, 119; *proinde ut*, 107, 109, 110.
- Prolepsis, in indirect questions, 335.
- prolubium*, in *prolubio est*, with inf., 411.
- promereo*, with *ut ne* and subjv., 240; with *ut* and subjv., 241; *promereo quam ob rem*, with subjv., 248.
- Promising, verbs of, with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
- promitto*, with inf., 371, 387, 415; with pres. inf. = fut., 427.
- promus sum*, with *ne* and subjv., 222.
- Pronominal questions, indirect in ind., 120; in subjv., 328.
- propereo*, with inf., 405.
- propterea quod*, 124.

prospicio, with *ut ne* and subjv., 230.
prostibuli est, with inf., 395.
 Protasis in subjv., with ind. apodosis, 283.
provideo, with *ne* and subjv., 231.
 Provisos, 268 ff.; with *dum*, 268; with *dum ne*, *dum ni*, 269; with *dum modo*, 269; with *modo*, 269; with *ut modo*, *modo ut*, 269.
provoco, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
pudet, with inf., 395, 411.
pudicilia est, with inf., 395.
pudor, with inf., 411.
pulchrum est, with inf., 395, 411.
 Purpose, subjunctive of, 255 ff.
puto, with inf., 375, 387, 415.

Q

qua, with ind., 143; *qua* in indirect questions in ind., 122; in subjv., 330; *quaqua*, 143.
quaeso, with subjv., 217; with *ut* and subjv., 218, 250; with *ne*, *ut ne*, *ni*, and subjv., 219; with inv., 357.
qualis, in indirect questions in subjv., 330.
quam, in clauses of comparison, 115 ff.; *tam . . . quam*, 115; *ita . . . quam*, 116; *aeque . . . quam*, 116; with comparatives, 116; *quam magis . . . tam magis*, 117; *quam magis . . . magis*, 118; *quam magis . . . tam*, 118; with words implying comparison, 118; with superlatives, 118; *quam si*, with ind., 118; *quam si*, 'as if,' 'than if,' with subjv., 287; *quam* and subjv. without *ut*, 238, 322; *quam* interrogative, with ind. in indirect question, 121; subjv., 329; *quam dudum*, with pres. ind., 18; *quam mox*, with pres. ind., 23; *quam ob rem*, in indirect questions, in ind., 122; subjv., 330; *quam ob rem* in substantive clauses developed from the deliberative, 248.
quamquam, 140.
quamvis, with subjv., 270.
quando, temporal, 90 ff.; with pres. ind., 90; with imp. ind., 91; with fut. ind., 91; with perf. ind., 91; with plup. ind., 92; with fut. perf. ind., 92; *quando causal*, 132; *quandoquidem*, 133.
quantumvis, with subjv., 270.
quantus, in indirect questions, in ind., 121; subjv., 329; *quantum*, *quantus est*, with inf., 411.
quapropter, in indirect questions in ind., 122; in subjv., 330; in substantive clauses developed from the deliberative, 249.
quare, in indirect questions in subjv., 330.
quasi = sicut, 115; *quasi*, 'than if,' with ind., 118; *quasi*, 'as if,' with subjv., 285; 'than if,' 286; *quasi si*, with subjv., 286.
quatenus, causal, 136.
queo, with inf., 405.
queror, with inf., 371.
 Questions, with inv. force, 24 f.; deliberative questions in ind., 22; subjv., 178 ff.; repudiating questions in fut., 40; in subjv., 186 ff.; indirect questions, in ind., 120 ff.; in subjv., 326 ff.; double indirect questions, 332 f.; sentence-questions, see 'Sentence-Questions.'
qui, as indefinite reinforcing particle with jussives, 164; with optatives, 193; *qui = ut*, in purpose clauses, 261; in volitive substantive clauses, 229, 236; *qui ne = ut ne*, 230; *qui*, 'how,' in indirect questions, in ind., 122; in subjv., 329; *qui minus*, in negative questions of duty or fitness in the subjv., 183.
quia, with ind., 126 ff.; *nisi quia*, 128; substantive *quia*-clauses, 130; with subjv., 318.
quid est, with inf., 411; *quid est cur*, *quid facio cur*, with subjv., 248; *quid facio quapropter*, with subjv., 249; *quid est quod*, 'what is the reason why,' with ind., 136 f.; with subjv., 241; *quid hoc est quod*, *quid hoc negotist quod*, 136; *quid merui qua causa*, with subjv., 249; *quid si*, with ind., 64, 67, 72; 75; with subjv., 276, 277, 280, 282; *quid vis*, with subjv., 216.
quiesco, with inf., 405.
quin, with questions having inv. force, 24; in neg. questions of duty or fitness in subjv., 183; in substantive clauses developed from the deliberative, 246; *quin = qui non*, with subjv., 290; in relative clauses of result, 298; adverbial *quin*-clauses, 300; *quin* in indirect questions, in subjv., 329; with inv., 350, 358.
quippe qui, 138.
quis, in indirect questions in ind., 120; in subjv., 328; *quis est qui*, *quin*, with subjv., 290; *quis est qui*, with ind., 290.
quisquam, with plu. verb, 3.
quisque, with plu. verb, 3.
quitur, *quitus sum*, with pass. inf., 7.
quo, in indirect questions, 122; in subjv., 329; *quo*, relative, 143; *quoquo*, 143; *quo = ut*, in purpose clauses, 261; *quo minus*, *quo setius*, 261; *non quo*, in causal clauses, 319.

- quoad*, with ind., 144; with subjv., in indirect questions, 331.
quod causal, with ind., 123 ff.; substantive *quod*-clauses, 124 ff.; *quod*, 'as to the fact that,' 125; *quod*, 'in that,' 126; *nisi quod*, 126; *quid est quod*, 136; *hoc est quod*, 137; *quod* with subjv., 318; *quod*, 'although,' 338; *quod si*, with ind., 65, 74.
quod sciam, 295 f.
quoia, with indirect question in subjv., 330.
quoiatis, with indirect question in subjv., 330.
quom temporal, with ind., 79 ff.; with subjv., 302; *quom . . . atque*, 82; *quom extemplo*, 83; *quom primum*, 83; *quom puto*, in elliptical expressions, 83; *quom inversum*, 84; *quom explicative*, 84, 85; *quom* 'since' (temporal), 85; *quom* 'while,' 85; *quom interea*, *interim*, 85; *quom magis = quo magis*, 86; *quom* causal, with ind., 133; with subjv., 302; *quom* adversative, with ind., 141; with subjv., 303; *quom* in descriptive clauses, 292; substantive *quom*-clauses, 85, 135; *quom* iterative, 81, 338; *quom = si*, 303.
quoniam, temporal, 92 ff.; *quoniam . . . atque*, 93; *quoniam* causal, 132.
quorsum, in indirect questions in subjv., 331.
quot, in indirect questions in the ind., 123; subjv., 330.
quotiens, *quotiensquomque*, 144.
quotumus, in indirect questions with subjv., 330.
- R
- rabo*, with *ut* and subjv., 267.
rationem capio ut neque . . . neque, with subjv., 230.
rectius est, with inf., 395.
recurro, with inf. of purpose, 418.
recuso, with *quin* and subjv., 247.
reddo, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with perf. partic., 438.
redigo, with *ut* and subjv., 224.
refert, with inf., 395, 411.
 Reflexive use of the passive, 6 f.
 Rejoicing, verbs of, with *quom* and ind., 134.
 Relative clauses, in ind., causal, 137; adversative, 142; subjv., of purpose, 258; descriptive, 288 ff.; causal, 291; adversative, 294; of result, 298.
religio est, with inf., 411.
reliqueram, as aoristic plup., 51.
 Reminiscent imp., 38.
- remitto*, with inf., 405.
remoror, with *quin* and subjv., 247.
renuntio, with inf., 371, 387, 389, 415; *renuntiatum est*, 392.
reor, with inf., 375, 387, 415.
reperio, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with inf., 376, 415; *reperior*, with inf., 389.
reprimo, with *quin* and subjv., 247.
repromitto, with inf., 371, 387; with pres. inf., = fut., 427.
 Repudiating questions, in ind., 21, 40; in subjv., 186 ff.
 Requesting, verbs of, with subjv., 217.
res, with inf., 399, 413; *ex tua re est*, with *ut* and subjv., 239; *rem gero*, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
rescisco, with inf., 376.
 Resolving, verbs of, with subjv., 236 f.
respondeo, with *ut* and subjv., 214; with inf., 371, 387.
responsum, with inf., 397.
restat, with *ut* and subjv., 242; with inf., 411.
 Restrictive clauses, 295.
 Result clauses, 297 ff.; with *ut*, 297; relative clauses of result, 298; substantive clauses of result, 299.
retineo, with *quin* and subjv., 246.
revereor, with *quo minus* and subjv., 254.
rideo, with inf., 378.
ridiculum est, with inf., 411.
rogo, with *ut* and subjv., 218; with gerundive, 444.
rumor est, with inf., 371, 387.
- S
- saluti est*, with inf., 411.
sanctius habeo, with inf., 388.
sane, with imv., 350.
sat est, with inf., 395, 412; *sat habeo*, with inf., 406; *satis est*, with subjv., 242; with *ut* and subjv., 242.
satius est, with subjv., 250; with *ut* and subjv., 251; with inf., 395, 412; *satius fuerat*, 52.
scelus videtur, with inf., 396.
scilicet, with inf., 376, 387.
scio, with inf., 376, 387, 405; with pres. inf. = fut., 427; *scivi = scio*, 46.
scisco, with inf., 376.
scitum est, with inf., 412.
scribo, with inf., 371, 387.
sed si, 71.
segnities est, with inf., 412.
 Sentence-Questions, 460 ff.; introduced by *-ne*, 460 ff.; appended to verb, 460 ff.;

- to pronouns, 466 ff.; to nouns, 468; to adjs. and participles, 469; to adverbs, 469; *potin*, 471; *nonne*, 472; to relatives, 472; to conjunctions, 473; to interrogatives, 473; introduced by *num*, *nunnam*, *numquis*, *numquid*, 473 ff.; by *ecquis*, *ecquid*, *enumquam*, 475 f.; questions without interrogative particle, 476 ff.; introduced by *non*, 478 ff.; by *iam*, *etiam*, 480 ff.; continued and supplementary questions, 481; *an* and disjunctive questions, 484 ff.; complete disjunctive questions, 486 ff.; indirect questions, sentence-questions in the subjv., 331 ff.
- sententia*, with *ut* and subjv., 221, 237.
- sentio*, with inf., 376, 387, 415.
- Sequence of tenses, in subjv., 338 ff.; after hist. pres., 341 f.; after pres. perf. ind., 339; after the hist. perf., 341; after pres. subjv., 342; after the imp. subjv., 343; after the perf. subjv., 343; after the pres. inf., 344; after fut. inf., 346; after perf. inf., 346.
- servile est*, with inf., 396.
- 'Shifted' imp. ind., 36; fut. perf., 59.
- si*, in conditions, see under conditional sentences, 60 ff., 273 ff.; 'concessive' *si*, with ind., 78; with subjv., 282; *si* temporal, 73; in indirect questions, in ind., 122; in subjv., 331; *si est qui*, with subjv., 290; *si minus*, 61, 63, 69, 71; *si modo*, with ind., 61, 63, 66, 70; with subjv., 275; *si non*, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 273, 275, 281; *si neque = si non*, 71; *si parum*, 71; *si quis* with plu. verb, 2; *si . . . sive*, in cond. sentences, 61, 73.
- sic . . . ut*, 108; in asseverations, 44.
- sicubi*, with ind., 143.
- sicut*, 113 ff.; = *qualis*, 114; *sicut* causal, 114; in asseverations, 114.
- signum*, with *ut* and subjv., 267; *signum do*, with *ne* and subjv., 215; with inf., 371.
- similis atque*, 119.
- simul*, *simul ac*, *simul ut*, 106.
- simulo*, with *quasi* and subjv., 286; with inf., 371, 405.
- sin*, 61, 64, 65, 69, 71, 74, 275; *sin secus*, 70.
- Single questions, indirect, in subjv., 332.
- Singular verb, with compound subject, 1; with subjects connected by disjunctive particles, 2.
- sino*, with subjv., 234; with *ut* and subjv., 235; with inf., 381, 387, 415.
- sis*, with inv., 349, 357.
- sive*, in cond. sentences, 69.
- sodes*, with inv., 349.
- soleo*, with inf., 405, 416.
- sollicitor*, with *ne* and subjv., 253.
- solus qui*, with subjv., 290.
- somnio*, with inf., 376.
- sors*, 'doom,' with *ut* and subjv., 237.
- spatium*, with *ut* and subjv., 235.
- specto*, with inf., 376, 415; *spectatum est*, 396.
- spero*, with *ut* and subjv., 251; with inf., 376, 387, 405, 415; with pres. inf. = fut., 427.
- spes*, with *ut* and subjv., 251; with inf., 376, 387.
- spicio*, with inf., 377.
- spondeo*, with inf., 371.
- stabile est*, with inf., 396.
- statuo*, with *ut* and subjv., 236.
- Striving, verbs of, with subjv., 229 f.
- studeo*, with *ut* and subjv., 229; with inf., 381, 405.
- studiosus*, with gerundive, 443.
- studium*, with inf., 405.
- stultitia est*, with inf., 396, 412.
- stultum est*, with inf., 412.
- suadeo*, with subjv., and subjv. with *ut*, 221; with *ne*, *ut ne*, *ut non*, and subjv., 222; with inf., 381.
- suave est*, with inf., 412.
- suavius est*, with inf., 396, 397.
- subigo*, with *ut* and subjv., 224; with inf., 381, 387; *subigor*, with inf., 389.
- Subject of inf., understood, 383 f.
- Subjunctive, origin of name, 145; original force, 147 ff.; subjv. in principal clauses, 161 ff.; volitive uses, 161 ff.; subjv. of determined resolution, 161; jussive, 162 f.; as protasis, 178; hortatory, 166; prohibitive, 167; in indirect discourse, 178; connecting negatives in prohibitive, 170, 171; use of negatives in the prohibitive, 173; permissive subjv., 174; of compliance, 176; of unfulfilled past obligation, 176; concessive subjv., 178; deliberative, 178 ff.; subjunctive of inquiry after a command, 179; of duty or fitness, 179; true deliberatives, 184; of impossibility or helplessness, 185; repudiating questions, 186; optative subjv., 191; asseverative opt., 194, 196; connecting negs. with opt., 195, 196, 197; *non* with opt., 195; potential subjv., 197 ff.; *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, 198 f.; potential as apodosis, 201 ff.; 'may' potentials, 205 f.; 'can'-'could' potentials, 206;

- subjv., in subordinate clauses, 208 f.; parataxis and hypotaxis, 208; substantive clauses, 209 ff.; 'extensions and original uses,' 210 ff.; substantive clauses developed from the volitive, 210 ff.; from the jussive and prohibitive, 212 ff.; with verbs of ordering and commanding, 212 ff.; with *volo*, *nolo*, 215 f.; with verbs of begging and requesting, 217; with *impetro*, *exoro*, etc., 219; with verbs of advising, inducing, compelling, 220 ff.; with *fac*, *facito*, etc., 224 ff.; with *efficio*, *perficio*, etc., 228; with *curo* and expressions of striving, 229 f.; with *vide*, *videto*, 230 ff.; with *cave*, *caveto*, 232 ff.; with verbs of permitting, granting, allowing, etc., 234 f.; with *potui*, 237; with *optimum est*, *aequum est*, *oportet*, *decet*, *tempus est*, etc., 238; with *opus est*, *usus est*, *necesse est*, 239; with verbs of hindering, preventing, etc., 239 f.; with verbs of deserving, 240; with *quid est quod*, *nil est quod*, 241; perfect subjv. with fut. force in subst. clauses, 242; connecting negs. in subst. clauses developed from jussive and prohibitive, 243; substantive clauses developed from the deliberative, 246; from the opt., 249; perf. subjv. referring to fut. in subst. clauses developed from the opt., 251 f., 255; subjv. with verbs of fearing, 252 ff.; subjv. of purpose, 254 ff.; with *ut*, 256; with *ne*, 257; with *ut ne*, 258; rel. clauses of purpose, 255; with *dignus*, *indignus*, *idoneus*, etc., 260; purpose clauses with *quo*, *quo minus*, *quo setius*, 261; with *qui = ut*, 261; subst. clauses of purpose, 262; connecting negs. in purpose clauses, 263; stipulative subjv., 263; clauses of proviso, with *dum*, 268; with *dum ne*, *dum ni*, 269; with *dum modo*, 269; with *ut modo*, *modo ut*, 269; *dum*-clauses denoting a wish, 270; subjv. with *quantvis*, *quantumvis*, 'although,' 270; subjv. in conditional sentences, 271 ff.; 'concessive' *si*-clauses, 282; subjv. protasis with ind. apodosis, 283; dependent cond. sentences, 284; clauses of conditional comparison, 285 ff.; with *quasi*, 285; with *quam si*, 287; with *ut si*, *tamquam*, *tamquam si*, *ac si*, *ut quasi si*, 287; descriptive clauses, 288; potential descriptive clauses, 288; descriptive clauses of fact ('clauses of characteristic'), 289; causal descriptive clauses, 292; adversative descriptive clauses, 294; jussive descriptive clauses, 294; deliberative descriptive clauses, 295; optative descriptive clauses, 295; restrictive clauses, 295; result clauses, with *ut*, 297; relative clauses of result, 298; substantive clauses of result, 299; adverbial *quin*-clauses, 300; *quom*-clauses, 302; *quom* temporal, 302; *quom* causal, 302; *quom* adversative, 303; *quom = si*, 303; subjv. with *dum* temporal, *donec*, *donecum*, 304 ff.; subjv. by attraction, 305 ff.; subjv. in oratio obliqua, 315; implied indirect discourse, 318; subjv. in principal clauses in oratio obliqua, 318; subjv. with *quod*, *quia*, *quo*, etc., 318 ff.; subjv. of indefinite 2d sing. in subordinate clauses, 319; subjv. with *quam*, *ante quam*, *prius quam*, *potius quam*, 322 ff.; subjv. in indirect questions, 326; pronominal questions, 328; sentence-questions, 331 ff.; single questions, 332; double questions, 332 f.; fut. time in indirect questions, 334; prolepsis in indirect questions, 335; subjv. with *quod*, 'although,' 338; iterative subjv., 338; sequence of tenses in the subjv., 338 ff.
- submoneo*, with *ut* and subjv., 221.
- subolet*, with inf., 396.
- Subordinate clauses in ind., 60 ff.; in subjv., 208 ff.; see the different introductory particles.
- Substantive clauses, in ind., *si*-clauses, 77 f.; *quod*-and *quia*-clauses, 124 ff., 130 ff.; subjv., developed from volitive; 210 ff.; jussive and prohibitive, 212 ff.; from deliberative, 246; from opt., 249; of purpose, 262; of result, 299; with *quasi*, 286; subst. stipulative clauses, 267; subst. *si*-clauses, 275.
- Substantive use of participles, 434, 440.
- sueo*, with inf., 405.
- sultis*, with imv., 349, 357.
- sunt qui*, with ind., 294.
- superbum est*, with inf., 397.
- Supine, 453 ff.; in-*um*, 453 ff.; in-*u*, 456; as abl. of separation, 457.
- Supplementary questions, 481.
- suspectum*, with *quin* and subjv., 248.
- suspicio*, with inf., 377.
- suspikor*, with inf., 377, 388.
- susurratur*, with inf., 396.
- Swearing, verbs of, with fut. inf. = pres., 426.
- sycophantia*, with *qui*, *ut*, and subjv., 230.

T

tabulas fero, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
taedet, with inf., 412.
talis ac, 119.
tam etsi, 139; *tamen etsi*, 140.
tam . . . quam, 115; *tam . . . ut*, 108.
tamen etsi, *tamen si*, 140.
tamquam = sicut, 119; with subjv., 287;
tamquam si, with subjv., 287.
tardo, with inf., 381.
techina, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
tela, with *ut* and subjv., 230.
tempero, with inf., 405.
 Temporal clauses, in ind., 79 ff.; see
 under the various introductory con-
 junctions.
tempto, with inf., 405.
tempus est, with *ut* and subjv., 238; with
 inf., 417.
teneo, with *quin* and subjv., 246; with
 inf., 405, 415.
 Tenses, 10 ff.; see under the separate
 tenses.
tento, with *ut* and subjv., 229.
 Terminative action, 10.
testis, with inf., 371.
 Thanking, verbs of, with *quom*-clause,
 134.
 Threatening, verbs of, with pres. inf. =
 fut., 426.
timeo, with *ne* and subjv., 253.
timidus sum, with *ne* and subjv., 253.
 Time-sphere, in tenses, 10.
 Titles, inf. in, 425.
tolero, with inf., 378.
 Transitive verbs, used intrans., 4.
tuom est, with inf., 412.
turpe est, with inf., 396.

U

ubi, 86 ff.; *ubi quando*, 86; *ubi primum*,
 90; *exemplo ubi*, 90; *ubi* with condi-
 tional force, 90; substantive *ubi*-clauses,
 90; *ubi* iterative, 87, 89; *ubi*, 'where,'
 142; *ubi ubi*, 142; *ubi* interrogative, in
 indirect questions, in ind., 121; in subjv.,
 329; with descriptive clauses in subjv.,
 292; in relative clauses of result, 298;
ubiquomque (local), 143.
unde, interrogative in ind. questions, in
 ind., 122; in subjv., 329; *unde* relative,
 in ind., 143; in descriptive clauses,
 292.
unum, with inf., 399.
unus qui, with subjv., 290.

usus est, with *ut* and subjv., 239; with inf.,
 412; *usus est facto* with *ut* and subjv.,
 227.
ut temporal, 93 ff.; *ut . . . atque*, 93; *ut*
primum, 94; *ut semel*, 93; *ut*, 'since,'
 94; *ut*, 'after,' 94; *ut* in comparisons,
 106 ff.; *ut . . . ita*, *ut . . . item*, *ut . . .*
itidem, *ut . . . proinde*, 106 ff., 108, 109,
 110; *sic . . . ut*, 108; *tam . . . ut*, 108;
perinde . . . ut, 109; *exinde . . . ut*, 109;
hoc modo, *hoc pacto . . . ut*, 109; *pariter*
. . . ut, 107, 109; *idem . . . ut*, 109; *adae-*
que . . . ut, 109; *adsimulo ut*, 109; *ut*
. . . ita, = *qualis . . . talis*, 110 f.; *ita . . .*
ut, in asseverations, 111; *ut = quanto*,
 113; *ut* causal, 112; *ut*, 'how,' in indis.
 questions in ind., 121; in subjv., 328; *ut*
 as reinforcing particle, with jussives,
 164 f.; with optatives, 193, 196; *ut* in
 repudiating questions, 189, 191; in pur-
 pose clauses, 256 ff.; *ut*, 'on pain of,'
 265; 'on condition that,' 265; in result
 clauses, 297; *ut*, 'although,' 270; *ut*
modo, in clauses of proviso, 269; with
 jussives, 165 ad fin.; *ut ne*, in substan-
 tive clauses developed from volitive, 215,
 219, 220, 222, 228, 230, 237, 240, 241, 251;
 in purpose clauses, 258; with stipulative
 subjvs., 265, 266; *ut neque . . . neque*, in
 volitive subst. clauses, 230; *ut quasi si*,
 with subjv., 287; *ut si*, with subjv., 287.

ut ut, with ind., 142.
uter, with plu. verb, 2; in indirect ques-
 tion in ind., 122; in subjv., 329.
uterque, with plu. verb, 2.
utibile est, with inf., 412.
utile est, with inf., 396, 412.
utin, in repudiating questions, 190, 191.
utinam, with optative subjv., 193, 196.
utquomque, 113.
utrum, in indirect questions, in ind., 122;
 in subjv., 332.
utrum . . . an, *utrum . . . -ne . . . an*,
utrum -ne . . . -ne, in sentence-ques-
 tions, 487; *utrum . . . an* (*anne*), *utrum*
-ne . . . an, *utrum -ne . . . an non*, in
 indirect questions, 333.

V

velim, as potential, 198 f.; with subjv.,
 249; with *ut* and subjv., 250; with *ne*
 and subjv., 251.
velut-clauses, 114; *velut*, 'just as,' and 'for
 example,' 114; *consimilis velut*, 115.
veneror, with *ne* and subjv., 219; with *ut*
 and subjv., 218, 251.

- venio*, with inf. of purpose, 419; *venit in mentem*, with *ut* and subjv., 221.
- Verba affectuum, with inf. and subj. acc., 377 ff.; verba declarandi, with inf. and subj. acc., 367; verba sentiendi, with inf. and subj. acc., 372 ff.; verba voluntatis, with inf. and subj. acc., 379.
- verbum*, with *ut* and subjv., 221; with inf., 399, 412; *verba facio*, with *ut* and subjv., 221; *verba inicio*, with inf., 371; *verbis arcesso*, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
- vereor*, with *quin* and subj., 248; with *ne* and subjv., 253; with *ut* and subjv., 254; with inf., 379, 405.
- verisimile non est quin*, with subjv., 247; *verisimile est*, with inf., 396.
- vide*, *videte*, *videto*, with subjv., 231; with *ut* and subjv., 231; with *ne* and subjv., 231.
- videlicet*, with inf., 377, 388.
- video*, with inf., 377, 388, 415; *videor*, 389; *video*, with perf. pass. partic., 438; *videtur*, with inf., 396; *visum est*, with subjv., 236.
- vinco*, with *ne* and subjv., 223; with *quin* and subjv., 247; with inf., 372, 388.
- virtus est*, with inf., 412.
- vis est*, with inf., 412.
- vis*, *vin*, *visne*, with subjv., 216; *numquid vis quin*, and subjv., 247.
- vixisse*, 'to be dead,' 428.
- vocito*, with *ut* and subjv., 214.
- voco*, with inf. of purpose, 419.
- Voices, 4; passive used reflexively, 6; attraction to passive, 7.
- Volitive subjv., in independent sentences, 161 ff.; in independent sentences, 210 ff.; volitive use of fut. ind., 38 ff.
- volo*, with subjv., 215 f., 249; with *ut* and subjv., 250; with *ut ne* and subjv., 251; with inf., 381, 388, 405, 415; with perf. inf. = pres., 428; with perf. pass. partic., 438.
- voltisne*, with subjv., 216.
- volueram*, as aoristic plup., 51.
- volup est*, with inf., 396, 397, 412.
- voluptatem capio*, with inf., 379.
- vostrum est*, with inf., 397.
- voto*, with inf., 382, 388; *votor*, with inf., 389.
- voceo*, with *ut* and subjv., 236; with inf., 372; with pres. inf. = fut., 427.
- Vowing, verbs of, with pres. inf. = fut., 426.
- W
- Wishing, verbs of, with subjv., 249 f.



This preservation copy
was created, printed, and bound
at Bridgeport National Bindery, Inc.,
in compliance with U.S. copyright law.
The paper used meets the requirements
of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992
(Permanence of Paper).

P A

2008



